

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 12, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

On this day our prayers, O God, are with those people who have great responsibility for the ordering of the nations. As leaders reflect on their actions and the directions they should take, aware of the pressures from every side, may they see more clearly the demands of justice, the concern for fairness, and the joyous opportunities of a world at peace. May Your gifts of wisdom and judgment promote liberty for the nations and freedom for every individual. Bless us, gracious God, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 94, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie	Bevill	Clement
Ackerman	Billbray	Clinger
Alexander	Bonior	Coleman (TX)
Anderson	Borski	Collins (IL)
Andrews (ME)	Boucher	Combest
Andrews (TX)	Boxer	Condit
Annuzio	Brooks	Costello
Anthony	Broomfield	Cox (IL)
Applegate	Browder	Coyne
Archer	Brown	Cramer
Aspin	Bruce	Darden
Atkins	Bryant	Davis
AuCoin	Bustamante	de la Garza
Bacchus	Byron	DeLauro
Barnard	Callahan	Dellums
Barton	Campbell (CO)	Derrick
Bateman	Cardin	Dingell
Bellenson	Carper	Donnelly
Bennett	Carr	Dooley

Dorgan (ND)	LaRocco	Rinaldo	Franks (CT)	Livingston	Schaefer
Downey	Levin (MI)	Ritter	Gallo	Machtley	Schroeder
Duncan	Lewis (GA)	Roemer	Gekas	McCandless	Sensenbrenner
Durbin	Lipinski	Rose	Gilchrest	McCollum	Shays
Dwyer	Lloyd	Rostenkowski	Gingrich	Miller (OH)	Sikorski
Early	Long	Roth	Goodling	Miller (WA)	Smith (OR)
Eckart	Lowey (NY)	Rowland	Goss	Molinari	Smith (TX)
Edwards (CA)	Lukens	Roybal	Grandy	Moorhead	Solomon
Edwards (OK)	Manton	Russo	Hancock	Nussle	Stearns
Edwards (TX)	Martin	Sabo	Hansen	Paxon	Stump
English	Martinez	Sanders	Hastert	Pursell	Sundquist
Erdreich	Matsui	Sangmeister	Hefley	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
Espy	Mavroules	Sarpalius	Henry	Regula	Thomas (WY)
Evans	Mazzoli	Sawyer	Hobson	Rhodes	Upton
Fascell	McCloskey	Scheuer	Inhofe	Ridge	Vucanovich
Feighan	McCrery	Schiff	Jacobs	Riggs	Walker
Fish	McCurdy	Schulze	James	Roberts	Weldon
Flake	McDade	Schumer	Kolbe	Rogers	Wolf
Foglietta	McDermott	Sharp	Kyl	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Ford (TN)	McEwen	Shaw	Lagomarsino	Ros-Lehtinen	Zeliff
Frank (MA)	McGrath	Shuster	Leach	Roukema	Zimmer
Frost	McHugh	Sisisky	Lewis (FL)	Santorum	
Gaydos	McMillan (NC)	Skaggs	Lightfoot	Saxton	
Gedden	McMillen (MD)	Skeen			
Gephardt	McNulty	Skelton			
Geren	Meyers	Slattery			
Gibbons	Mfume	Slaughter (NY)			
Gilman	Michel	Slaughter (VA)			
Glickman	Mineta	Smith (FL)			
Gonzalez	Mink	Smith (IA)			
Gordon	Moakley	Smith (NJ)			
Gradison	Mollohan	Snowe			
Green	Montgomery	Solarz			
Guarini	Moody	Spence			
Gunderson	Morella	Spratt			
Hall (OH)	Morrison	Staggers			
Hall (TX)	Mrazek	Stallings			
Hamilton	Murtha	Stenholm			
Hammerschmidt	Myers	Studds			
Harris	Natcher	Swett			
Hayes (IL)	Neal (MA)	Swift			
Hayes (LA)	Neal (NC)	Synar			
Hefner	Nichols	Tallon			
Hertel	Oaker	Tanner			
Hoagland	Oberstar	Tauzin			
Hochbrueckner	Obey	Taylor (MS)			
Horn	Olin	Thomas (GA)			
Horton	Oliver	Thornton			
Hoyer	Orton	Torres			
Hubbard	Owens (UT)	Torricelli			
Huckaby	Oxley	Traficant			
Hughes	Packard	Traxler			
Hutto	Pallone	Unsold			
Jefferson	Panetta	Valentine			
Jenkins	Parker	Vander Jagt			
Johnson (CT)	Patterson	Vento			
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Visclosky			
Johnson (TX)	Pease	Volkmmer			
Johnston	Pelosi	Walsh			
Jones (GA)	Penny	Waxman			
Jontz	Perkins	Weber			
Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)	Weiss			
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Whitten			
Kasich	Petri	Williams			
Kennedy	Pickett	Wilson			
Kennelly	Porter	Wise			
Kildee	Poshard	Wolpe			
Kleczka	Price	Wyden			
Klug	Quillen	Wyllie			
Kopetski	Rahall	Yates			
Kostmayer	Rangel	Young (FL)			
LaFalce	Ravenel				
Lancaster	Reed				
Lantos	Richardson				

NAYS—94

Allard	Boehlert	Coleman (MO)
Armey	Boehner	Coughlin
Baker	Bunning	Cox (CA)
Ballenger	Burton	DeLay
Barrett	Camp	Dickinson
Bentley	Campbell (CA)	Dorman (CA)
Bereuter	Chandler	Ewing
Bilirakis	Clay	Fawell
Bliley	Coble	Fields

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Payne (NJ)

NOT VOTING—60

Andrews (NJ)	Galleghy	Marlenee
Berman	Gillmor	Miller (CA)
Brewster	Hatcher	Moran
Chapman	Herger	Murphy
Collins (MI)	Holloway	Nagle
Conyers	Hopkins	Nowak
Cooper	Houghton	Ortiz
Crane	Hunter	Owens (NY)
Cunningham	Hyde	Pickle
Dannemeyer	Ireland	Ray
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Roe
Dicks	Kolter	Savage
Dixon	Laughlin	Serrano
Doolittle	Lehman (CA)	Stark
Dreier	Lehman (FL)	Stokes
Dymally	Lent	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	Levine (CA)	Towns
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Washington
Fazio	Lowery (CA)	Waters
Ford (MI)	Markey	Yatron

□ 1226

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during roll call No. 254 on the Riggs motion on approval of the Journal, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the Pentagon. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] if he would come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WELDON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 272. An act to provide for a coordinated Federal program to ensure continued United States leadership in high-performance computing, and for other purposes.

IT IS TIME TO HELP OUR OWN CITIZENS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, they are back; they are back, Members of Congress who spent a month in their districts. They are back, the President and members of his staff who spent a month in Maine. They are back, Mr. Speaker.

But this group did not go anywhere. They are the unemployed, working families who have lost their jobs and are trying to work again.

They are back, those of us who are determined to press through to get unemployment, extended unemployment benefits, for these people.

Mr. Speaker, the President denied unemployment benefits, extended unemployment benefits, when he refused to consider releasing these benefits by declaring a budget emergency, 13 more weeks of benefits to working families to help them pay the mortgage, to pay college tuition, to make the car payment.

This fall the Congress is going to be asked to help savings-and-loan depositors, to help banks, to help the Soviet Union. How about our citizens, those people who have been paying the taxes for years, the working American taxpayer who needs a little temporary help themselves? They are back, Mr. Speaker, and this time they are asking the President, "Let us do it right."

□ 1230

PASSIVE LOSS LEGISLATION

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has the opportunity to pass budget-neutral legislation to help resolve the S&L crisis and help turn around the recession. H.R. 1414 has 300 cosponsors, including a majority of the committee of jurisdiction, but we may not get a chance to vote on the bill.

H.R. 1414 changes the passive loss rules which penalize owners of rental property and unnecessarily drives many owners into foreclosure. The bill would allow rental property owners to continue operating their developments,

thereby reducing loan foreclosures and limiting failures among financial institutions. These failures create a burden for all taxpayers who have sunk billions of dollars into the RTC and perhaps face a similar prospect with the FDIC.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1414 is self-financing. Revenues foregone through the passive loss changes will be recouped from the same industry by lengthening depreciation on commercial property. Nevertheless, we hear that there will not be a vote on H.R. 1414, and there is no other vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, if a bill has 300 cosponsors, including a majority of the committee of jurisdiction, should the bill not come to the floor for a vote? I urge the Speaker to give us a vote on H.R. 1414 this year.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read part of a letter to the editor from the New Haven Register of September 5. Debra Wendland of West Haven, writes that the President and his men should, and I quote:

Go down to New Haven's union locals and shake hands with the men down there and ask them how long they have been out of work. I am sure the answer is not one or two months, more like 9 or 12 months with their unemployment running out long ago. Or go down to the local unemployment office and ask the 50-year-old man where is he going to get a job when his unemployment runs out?

Mr. Speaker, what does Debra Wendland know that all the President's men do not?

My people back home want their leaders to pay attention when they are hurting. They have watched as the President has offered emergency aid to the people of Bangladesh and Kuwait, and to the Kurds and the Soviets. All this while our own people cry out for disaster relief of their own.

In good times, they have paid their hard-earned taxes into an unemployment system that is now broke. For millions of Americans these are tough times, and they are calling out for the help that they have earned.

That 50-year-old man—and the millions like him—can no longer wait.

Mr. Speaker, they need our help now.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE GAS TAX INCREASE IN H.R. 2950

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the 5-cent Federal gas tax increase in H.R. 2950.

The committee's report on the bill claims that enacting a 5-cent gas tax

will "help make possible the charting of an audacious and bold new direction on the Nation's transportation policies." However, this new direction may be one filled with potholes, if we continue down the road of increasing gas taxes.

Studies have shown that for every penny increase in the gas tax it reduces GNP by \$1 billion. Congress' Budget Office estimates that families earning less than \$20,000 a year will spend at least eight times as high a percentage of their income for gasoline as do families that earn \$50,000 or more.

And rural families already spend twice as much for motor fuel taxes as do urban families.

Congress last year passed a 5-cent gas tax increase along to the American family, and less than a month later, our economy entered a recession. Has not Congress learned its lesson?

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the 5-cent increase in gasoline taxes.

THE NEED FOR UNEMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

(Mr. BUSTAMANTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Labor Department announced that the unemployment rate for August remained at 6.8 percent. In human terms, that means 8½ million Americans are out of work. In my State of Texas, 596,000 people are jobless. Before the August recess, Congress gave the President the opportunity to act on this problem when we passed emergency unemployment insurance legislation, H.R. 3201. But President Bush refused to invoke its provisions.

More than a million Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits. Hundreds of thousands more are dropped from the rolls each month. They are no longer afforded that basic measure of security that the Unemployment Insurance System was intended to provide. They have slipped through the holes of the Social Security safety net.

Soon we will be voting on the Unemployment Insurance Reform Act, H.R. 3040. This bill restores extended benefits to the long-term unemployed, and it equalizes benefits for ex-military personnel to those for civilian personnel.

When we established the Unemployment Insurance System in 1935, this country committed itself to providing some minimum level of income security for the jobless. Over the last 10 years, Americans' right to security has been eroded. Only three States qualify for extended unemployment insurance under the present system.

H.R. 3040 will improve that record. Joblessness is a personal crisis that

can turn into tragedy. Let's not turn that corner. Please support the Unemployment Insurance Reform Act when it comes to the floor for consideration.

GATT DOLPHIN RULING RAISES SERIOUS QUESTIONS

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, an international dispute panel has just ruled that certain U.S. import policies designed to help stop the unnecessary slaughter of marine mammals are in violation of our trade obligations. This ruling raises serious questions for me and for many of my constituents about whether proposed trade agreements will eventually lead to a degradation of our own environmental, health and safety standards. This ruling—which was sought by Mexico as a result of new United States import restrictions on tuna—could be seen as a test case of our ability to promote strong environmental policies around the world as part of international trade.

U.S. tuna companies have already proven that it is possible to use dolphin safe methods of catching tuna and still stay in business. We've seen that where there is the will, there is a way to reduce the needless killing. Unfortunately, it seems Mexico has still not fully demonstrated the will. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in southwest Florida are already quite skeptical about how a proposed trade agreement with Mexico could affect us; this recent ruling only heightens their concern. I have already urged the administration to stand by the United States' position on this issue, signaling to Mexico and all the nations involved with GATT that we will not sell out our principles or our Nation's best interests in our pursuit of free trade.

HOUSING AND REAL ESTATE INDUSTRIES CRITICAL IN RECESSSION TIMES

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, Congress returns to work this week with a long list of things to do. Topping that list, in my view, should be legislation to shift our sagging economy into high gear.

While many sectors of our economy clearly need our attention, one sector which is so critical to economic recovery, but which we seem to be ignoring is the housing and real estate industries. These industries typically lead us out of recessions, yet they are too weak to help much and now their troubles are spreading to other parts of the economy as well.

To those who would dismiss the problem as simply the fault of the industry, I would say take a long look at yourselves. In 1986, as part of the tax reform, Congress passed new passive loss rules intended to put an end to property tax shelters. Unfortunately, as we have learned the hard way, those rules also killed credible real estate investment and brought the market to its knees. Now many investors are unable to carry troubled properties and many lenders are going under because of large inventories of real estate they have taken back from borrowers. And in the end the taxpayer winds up paying the bill.

Taxpayers in my district already get enough bills, and I think it's time we took action to remedy this problem. My colleagues, MIKE ANDREWS and BILL THOMAS, have proposed a responsible solution in the form of H.R. 1414, which I strongly support. Passage of this bill would put real estate investment on an equal footing with other business investment and help to stabilize an important part of our economic pie.

THE VISION OF THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION PLAN

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to comment on one aspect of the President's domestic agenda, an agenda for America that is being held hostage by the chronic complainers, buck passers, and alibi artists of this body. One only needs to look at America 2000 to witness an exciting and innovative new program which is the beginning of the renaissance of education in America.

President Bush, in America 2000, reaffirms an idea which is becoming lost in America—the idea that communities and individuals can solve problems better than the Federal Government and Washington bureaucrats. America 2000 will place the responsibility for and direction of reform in the hands of community leaders, parents, and teachers—those who know best what works in the classroom and are most affected by the deficiencies in our educational system.

The debate over education is more than one between Republicans and Democrats. It is about the future and who should lead us on this journey. We have the vision of President Bush's education plan or we have Senator TED KENNEDY's education plan, which, despite the Democrats' rhetoric, is the only plan they have put forth. Do we want the plan which calls for innovation and change from the people, or do we want the plan that calls for more government and more bureaucrats? As a parent, the choice is obvious: We need the President's plan.

□ 1240

PRESIDENT BUSH'S SCORECARD ON WOMEN'S LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, to my side is a chart outlining all the women's legislation that President Bush has either promised to veto or vetoed. These 10 bills were drawn primarily from the agenda of the bipartisan congressional caucus for women's issues.

I am releasing this Bush veto score card so that women could keep track of the President's action on their issues.

The Bush record on women is worse than the Reagan record. At least Reagan was honest about his indifference toward women. Candidate Bush, however, campaigned for a kinder, gentler America promising family leave and civil rights. George Bush's campaign promises amounted to little more than political vogueing.

This Congress has taken historic strides in treating women as equal citizens in this country. We have fostered a revolution on research on women's health, passed a civil rights act that signals that discrimination against women will not be tolerated, stopped the erosion on women's right to choice, and told employers that they cannot make parents choose between their families and their jobs.

When these bills reach President Bush's desk, he employs an old skull and bones tradition: No women allowed.

I urge women not to let the Thomas Supreme Court nomination fight distract us from President Bush's effort to sabotage women's legislative agenda. The real task at hand is to make sure that we have a veto-proof Congress who will stand up to George Bush's near-derthal policies and will overturn the Bush Supreme Court decisions.

MEDIA COVERAGE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the August break, sitting there glued to a television, watching the glorious events unfolding in the Soviet Union, witnessing the fall of communism in Moscow, from where all of this evil spread across the world for 74 years, I caught up on some of my reading. I had missed a press conference here in March. I had a good excuse; I was in Croatia and then Albania for the elections there. I missed the press conference on March 26 by a group called the Center for Media and

Public Affairs, releasing this booklet on media coverage of the Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, it is a stunning document. I am going to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in pieces or chapters over the next few weeks.

It was produced under the codirection of Dr. Robert Lichter and his Ph.D. wife, Linda, and Dr. Daniel Ahamson. It was sponsored by the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights.

This weekend PBS in Los Angeles ran this infamous film created by radical homosexual activists called "Stop the Church." Can you imagine a film called "Stop Judaism"? Or "Stop African-Americans"? Or "Stop the Democrats"? Or better yet, "Stop the Liberals"?

If the media treated one of the world's great religions, Judaism, the way it has been treating the Catholic Church the last 10 years, it would be branded properly as vicious, bigoted, and anti-Semitic. And they would receive similar invective if they treated black Americans the way they have treated the Catholic Church.

Some of us are loyal Catholics, and we are going to fight back. The battle is now joined.

Get this book, "Media Coverage of the Catholic Church." It is a disgrace how the media has collaborated with anti-Catholic bigots to defame the church. Stop the church? I say stop the bigots.

HOW TO MAKE IT TO THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, everybody is asking: How do you make it to the Supreme Court?

Let us take Judge Souter. He had no, if any, legal opinions; he never looked his confirmers in the eye. And rumors persist that he flies a B-2 bomber. He cannot even be detected by radar.

On the other hand take a look and take Judge Bork, please take Judge Bork. He told it like it was, he bared his soul and more. And guess what? Souter is in, Bork is out.

Let us say one thing: Judge Thomas is an intelligent man. All he has to do is review Souter versus Bork.

I agree with the NAACP, something is wrong when America knows more about Judge Wapner than Supreme Court nominees who will be Supreme Court judges for life.

COMMENDING THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE ON THEIR COURAGEOUS STAND FOR FREEDOM

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a concurrent resolution commending the people of the Soviet Union on their courageous stand for freedom and democracy.

Throughout America, we watched intently as history unfolded before our eyes. Fear of a tragic crackdown leading the Soviet Union back into darkness quickly dissolved into the excitement of the dawning of a new era. Americans are a freedom-loving people and our hearts were warmed by the discovery that the instinct for liberty and democracy dwelt deeply in the soul of a nation where it had long been denied.

I believe this resolution will be an important message for the people of the United States of America to send to the people of the former Soviet Union. Freedom and democracy are not limited resources. We are eager to teach and share the practice of freedom, the art of democracy.

We do not know where the future will take the people of this part of our world, but the spirit of the August revolution provides a basis in humanity that has inspired mankind's finest moments.

Please join me in sponsoring this resolution to commend the people of the former Soviet Union on their courageous stand for democracy.

REFORM OF BANKING INDUSTRY MUST INCLUDE PASSIVE LOSS RULES CHANGE

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, FDIC Chairman William Seidman predicted that over the next 2 years, 400 U.S. banks will fail. Add to that the mounting FDIC losses and the administration's new \$80 billion request for the RTC and it becomes painfully clear that America's financial institutions are in bad shape.

Our colleagues on the committees of jurisdiction have pursued painstaking efforts to reform the banking industry. However, I want to direct their attention to an often overlooked but significant contributing factor to the problems that plague our financial institutions and our economy. I am talking about the passive loss rules that continue to penalize American taxpayers who own investment rental real estate.

These passive loss rules, which did not originate in this body, effectively prevent owners of real estate from working out troubled properties. As a result, these properties are frequently repossessed, undermining the soundness of our banking industry.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending in the Ways and Means Committee introduced by our colleagues

MIKE ANDREWS and BILL THOMAS and cosponsored by more than 300 of our colleagues, that goes a long way toward encouraging real estate professionals to work out distressed properties and keep them operating in the private sector and out of the inventories of the RTC and FDIC. This legislation would place real estate people on equal footing with other business professionals without restoring or creating abusive tax shelters.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Andrews-Thomas passive loss legislation is the most constructive tax legislation we could enact this year. And I sincerely hope this House has the opportunity to vote on it in 1991.

THE YUGOSLAVIAN CRISIS

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of people are dying and thousands are losing their homes in the fighting between Croats and Serbs.

America faces a dilemma. Americans want to do something to ease the crisis. But we have a longstanding commitment to international law. It prevents us from taking sides in the internal disputes of other nations.

However, that does not mean we are forced to sit on the sidelines and twiddle our thumbs. We should take a page from the strategy book that George Bush used in the gulf war.

Let us use the United Nations to keep the peace in Yugoslavia. Today I am offering a resolution that will call on the United Nations to dispatch a peacekeeping force to separate the parties and start the process of reconciliation.

In the gulf war, the United Nations demonstrated that it could live up to its original purpose, that it could be an effective force for maintaining the peace.

I urge my colleagues to give the United Nations an opportunity to show what it can do to stop the killing and promote peace on Earth.

HEALTH CARE REFORM: THE NEED IN IDAHO

(Mr. LAROCCO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the rural health care coalition, I went home in August to listen to the people of Idaho, and to examine the State's health care delivery systems. What I heard indicates that the health care crisis in rural America is growing.

At a congressional subcommittee hearing at St. Luke's Regional Medical Center in Boise, I gathered comprehen-

sive testimony from the young and old, business community leaders, insurance providers, health care professionals, and Government. Each witness dealt with the real life, day-to-day difficulties of the current health care situation, and I think it would be useful for Members of the House to consider what they had to say.

Idaho is the most underdoctored State in the Nation, and the situation is not improving.

Hospitals are pinching every penny to keep their doors open in rural communities.

Companies large and small are having trouble finding affordable insurance plans that meet the needs of their work force, and a surprising number of people are unable to find any health insurance at all for themselves and for their families.

But when all was said and done, there was one thing they all agreed on: We cannot maintain the status quo and achieve quality, affordable health care.

I found the testimony of Mr. Jim Thompson, president of the ECCO Co. in Boise, of particular interest.

Mr. Thompson has lived in Idaho for nearly 30 years, and in 1990, he was named the small businessman of the year by the Idaho Chamber of Commerce. He understands the importance of health care options in today's business world, and he has made extensive efforts to provide affordable, quality coverage for his company's team members and for their families. Unfortunately, in spite of his best efforts, he has not been able to obtain coverage that meets the requirements of his small business and his team members. Because his experience includes the full range of currently available options, I believe it would be instructive to consider his insights and remarks in the ongoing debate of health care reform. Mr. Speaker, I will insert Mr. Thompson's subcommittee hearing statement into the RECORD.

My constituents tell me there is a problem. The quality health care currently available in Idaho is in jeopardy. I think it is critical that we listen to the voices of Idaho, and of all rural America, and get on with the task of health care reform.

STATEMENT OF MR. JIM THOMPSON

Good Morning. My name is Jim Thompson. I'm the President of Electronic Controls Company [ECCO]. We're a small manufacturer with a single plant in Boise with 75 Team Members. We manufacture back-up Alarms (reverse-gear warning alarms for vehicles) and do Contract Manufacturing work for Hewlett Packard, Extended Systems, and other electronics companies. We sell our back-up alarm products all over the world against competitors from Japan, Taiwan, and Europe. ECCO has grown from 20 to 75 Team Members during the last 7 years. We are probably more concerned with the well being of our Team Members than most businesses our size. For instance:

We have an employee stock ownership plan (ESOP) that currently owns about 12% of the

company. We've made annual contributions since starting the plan 4 years ago.

We have a 401K plan that is 100% vested in the first year; designed as a "portable pension" plan.

We also have a profit bonus plan that distributes 20% of the company's pre tax profit to all Team Members every month. We also provide child care financial assistance. Other small businesses that provide fewer benefits are probably even more distressed over the increases in health insurance costs.

WHERE WE ARE NOW

ECCO's cost of health insurance has increased at an average rate of 20% per year for 7 years running. A cumulative increase of 260%! On the other hand, our customers have demanded lower costs which has reduced our average sell price by 50% over the same time period. Nowhere in the business world has there ever been an industry that has been able to raise prices the way the health insurance industry has done in America.

Please note these figures do not include costs paid by ECCO for medicare or Medicaid.

Currently our health insurance costs are about 2.5% of our sales dollar. Surely this will double in the next few years if left unchecked. It is well reported that health care cost is a larger cost component of an automobile than sheet metal. If America's businesses get saddled with higher costs than our world wide competitors, the result will be declining competitiveness and loss of jobs.

WHAT WE'VE DONE

We've done just about everything we could think of to reduce the impact of health insurance cost increases on our profits. Here's a list of the things I can remember:

1. We lengthened the "waiting period" for new Team Members health insurance eligibility to six months. The idea was to limit insurance to longer term Team Members only. We abandoned this 5 years ago because it was contrary to our company's way of doing things.

2. We increased the deductible amount and the number of deductibles per family.

3. We switched from a conventional medical insurance plan to an HMO. The year we did this our increase was only 12%, not the 25% offered by the conventional insurance. 1 year later we were back on the 20% increase per year track.

4. We increased the "co-payments" for doctor visits and prescriptions.

5. We encouraged Team Members with spouse employed elsewhere to have their spouse covered by the spouses employer only.

6. We raised the cost share of family coverage more than Team Member coverage to encourage Team Members to have their dependents covered by their spouses employer.

7. We raised the percentage of the total cost to be paid by the Team Member.

8. At one time we even asked prospective Team Members about their use of tobacco. The idea here was to only hire non-smokers. Ultimately, we planned to have a smoker-free work group and demand lower insurance costs. This has been temporarily abandoned.

Most of these actions either reduced benefits or shifted the cost burden to our Team Members. We only treated the symptom, not the cause.

I understand that once a company reaches about 100 Team Members the economics of self insurance makes sense. I hope that's so.

SOME SUGGESTIONS TO CONSIDER

1. Malpractice insurance costs should be reduced. Curtail settlements. The fear of

being sued encourages doctors to practice defensive medicine such as ordering unnecessary tests.

2. Policy makers should look at other rich nations health care plans for ideas. Particularly Germany and Japan. Read the health care survey in the July 6th Economist.

3. The Veterans Administration health care plan and hospitals should be privatized or in some way integrated into the existing health care systems.

4. There should be a "play-or pay" system for employers. Either they have their own plan or they buy into a state or federal pooled risk plan.

5. Encourage HMOs by tax incentive or other means. This is a great concept but needs a greater market presence to flourish.

6. No one should be able to collect from multiple insurers more than the cost of the health care service billed.

7. Do away with the exemption of employer paid insurance premiums from federal and state income taxes, biased to the "better-off". This will encourage companies to choose cheaper insurance.

8. Do away with individual tax deductibility of health insurance premiums for federal and state income taxes.

CONCLUSION

Health care reform is one of America's biggest public policy challenges over the next few years. More of the same is no longer a suitable outcome. I hope all policy makers will find a path that will stabilize health insurance costs.

Thank You LARRY LAROCCHIO and RICHARD STALLINGS for inviting me to offer this testimony.

□ 1250

THE PROBLEMS IN YUGOSLAVIA CAN BE SOLVED

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I visited Yugoslavia last week, and we went to Croatia and to Serbia. A lot of people are dying. In fact, last night the AP report pointed out that 10 to 15 died on both sides and about 30 were injured. There are women and children also being killed.

Some people in this country and in the world favor the Serbs, some favor the Croats, and perhaps most of us are perhaps neutral. But one thing we really cannot be neutral on is that the killing and the fighting ought to stop.

I call on President Bush and the Bush administration, Secretary of State and all of those in Congress to demand that there be a cease-fire, and anyone who violates the cease-fire, there ought to then be political and economic sanctions against them. With a cease-fire, peaceful negotiations and with a spirit of reconciliation this problem can be solved.

ARMS CONTROL: THE TIME IS NOW

(Mr. AUCCOIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet hardliners are gone. The Stalinists who dragged their feet for years on arms control are out. This gives us a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to rid the world of the threat of nuclear destruction.

Once the Soviets sort themselves out within a few months, we can expect them to be ready, willing, and eager to snap up any mutually beneficial arms control that we propose. They have been telling us that for the last month.

We can stop nuclear testing, we can stop ballistic missile flight testing and send every multiple warhead missile to the garbage dump, and, if we do these things, the threat of a nuclear Pearl Harbor will be gone, gone forever.

What a magnificent gift to our children and to their children. What a chance to build healthcare and education here in this country rather than warheads and missiles.

Regrettably the reaction of the Bush administration to this staggering opportunity seems to be a blank stare. Yesterday Defense Secretary Cheney said, "Whether or not there ought to be additional arms control is an open question."

Mr. Speaker, it is not an open question. We need real stabilizing arms control, and we need it now. If the administration cannot negotiate it, this Congress should legislate it.

LOAN GUARANTEES FOR ISRAEL SHOULD BE DELAYED

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am, and all of us are, facing a very difficult issue, and that is on the question of whether or not to delay the taking up of the issue of loan guarantees in the sum of \$10 billion for Israel in order to help that nation, that valiant nation, resettle Soviet emigres.

I have great respect for a nation which has traditionally, and which does again today, extend succor and aid, and assistance and comfort to people who are displaced and people who are adrift. But I also have great respect for my President who has said, in requesting a delay in the taking up of this issue, that the debate on it or the adoption of the loan guarantees could derail or certainly put great impediments in the next month's peace conference to try to settle the issues in the Middle East.

Facing this quandary, I take the position of my President and support him in this effort. And, I believe that the House and the Senate should do nothing which could impede one great result which could come from the gulf crisis, a lasting peace in the region.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge and hope that we do delay the issue of the loan guarantees for Israel.

THE MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RUN, JANE, RUN

(Ms. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the anniversary of an organization in my congressional district: Run, Jane, Run, which performs a valuable service for the citizens of this Nation.

Run, Jane, Run, which was established by the Fort Wayne Women's Bureau on September 12, 1980, organizes sporting events for amateur women athletes on behalf of women's centers in eight cities around the country. Profits earned from Run, Jane, Run events are funneled back to women's agencies which provide valuable services, such as shelters for battered or homeless women and their families, and other support services to women.

I am proud of the accomplishments of Run, Jane, Run. The work of this organization touches the lives of many Americans. Today I extend my warmest congratulations to the women and men who give so much to this important effort, and I thank them for their hard work and dedication.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3313, GRANTING MFN TO LATVIA, LITHUANIA, AND ESTONIA

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 3313. H.R. 3313 grants most favored nation treatment to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia immediately. No delay.

Mr. Speaker, these small, but precious, countries are entitled to this kind of treatment. It will help them recover.

As I learned when talking with the foreign minister of Estonia, celebrating its first day of its freedom; he said, "Lithuania has always been free. We've just been occupied for a great number of years."

That sort of sums up the attitude of these people. Granting them most favored nation treatment along with granting most favored nation treatment to the U.S.S.R. would mean the first constructive step we have to change this vast area of the world.

I just returned from a long and extensive trip in the U.S.S.R. with my subcommittee. I want to say that the opportunity has never been greater to influence this part of the world. They want and they need help, and their attitude is right. It is time for us to ex-

plot that. I think we first need a united position of free nations of the earth to get rid of the nuclear weapons the U.S.S.R. amassed by a commitment by the United States to do approximately the same thing.

NOT IN MY BACKYARD: REMOVING BARRIERS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, on July 8, 1991, Secretary Kemp's advisory commission on regulatory barriers to affordable housing presented a very important report outlining the results of a 2-year study on Government regulations which drive up housing costs for American families. I find the report most enlightening and commend to my colleagues an editorial entitled "Red Tape Housing" which appeared in the Wednesday, September 4, edition of the Wall Street Journal. As Members of Congress and servants of the public, we are all well aware of the growing housing affordability crisis in the United States, and I am particularly sensitive and aware of this problem because my congressional district represents 2 of the 10 most expensive and least affordable housing markets in the United States. What may not be as clear about this problem is why the problem is emerging and what specifically should be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, before being elected to Congress in 1990, I owned a small property development company in Santa Rosa, CA, and Santa Rosa is one of those communities in my district in the listing of the United States top 10 most expensive markets.

□ 1300

I can tell you from personal firsthand current experience about the deleterious effect that stringent anti-growth and well-intentioned environmental protection policies can have on affordability in a local housing market. I would argue that in many cases, such restrictions eventually backfire, compounding the very environmental growth problems they were designed to control.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will review the Wall Street Journal editorials, and will carefully consider the conclusions and representations in Secretary Kemp's report to President Bush entitled "Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing."

HOUSE SHOULD STAND FIRM ON DECISION TO SHOOT DOWN B-2 BOMBER

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Air Force reported that cracks in the B-2 bomber discovered more than a year ago will require a new titanium alloy and engineering changes costing some \$200 million.

Today we learn that the B-2 is not as stealthy as the Air Force had promised, and as the contractor, Northrop, had promised. The cost is estimated to be hundreds of millions of dollars to fix the latest problem with the B-2.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the House took the position that we should stop production of the B-2 at 15, and not authorize any more. The conference committee will be meeting this week. I sincerely hope that all Members will be communicating with our colleagues that are serving on this conference committee and urging them to stand by the position that we have taken, to stop further production of this monstrous waste of the taxpayers' money, and restore some sanity to what we are doing in the Pentagon budget.

As far as I am concerned, we should stop this plane's production at 15, and save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, and billions of dollars over the next decade. We have a great opportunity to do the taxpayers a great service, if we just stick by our position over the next few weeks. I urge Members to do that.

AMERICA SHOULD SHOW ITS SUPPORT FOR CROATIA

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, over the break I went to the Soviet Union just prior to the coup, and then went to Yugoslavia. I went more specifically to Croatia, which is under attack in a bloody act of aggression by its neighbor, Serbia.

It is about time that the United States not leave this problem solely to the Europeans to solve. The United States is a world leader. We have influence, and should use it to stop the bloody conflict that is going on in the Balkans today. Croatia is asking for nothing more than the right of its people to determine their own destiny and for democratic government.

Belgrade, the Serbian capital, is under the control of the last Stalinist regime in Europe. This Stalinist regime is committing monstrous atrocities against the people of Croatia, trying to subjugate them and steal territory from this newly elected republic.

Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely outrageous. The United States should take a tough stand. If the Stalinists in Serbia continue their atrocities, the murder and the mayhem they are committing

in Croatia, we should recognize Croatia and be willing to throw the complete economic and political influence of the United States behind these people in Croatia, who want nothing more than to have democracy, peace, and prosperity, and to be left alone.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans we should make sure that the people who are struggling in this conflict for freedom know that we are on the side of democracy, on the side of freedom, and the side of peace in the Balkans.

GREED AND SELFISHNESS IN BANKING SYSTEM MUST END

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, I spent almost 9 hours yesterday listening to the testimony of Clark Clifford and Robert Altman regarding their relationship to the Bank of Credit and Commerce, the BCCI. It was not a pleasant day.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what Mr. Clifford or Mr. Altman knew and whether they were being totally honest with the members of the committee, but this I do know: After having observed the S&L scandal, which exposed widespread corruption among banking leaders in the S&L industry, and after having observed the collapse of hundreds of commercial banks who were investing in Third World dictatorships, junk bonds, and speculative real estate, yesterday's testimony by these two distinguished American bankers was extremely distressing.

These gentlemen made huge profits by borrowing money from Middle Eastern billionaires, including governmental dictators, and then sold those investments, those stocks, for huge profits.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now for major reform in the American banking system. The function of our banks must be to reinvest in America, so we can build the affordable housing that we need, the factories that we need, and the small businesses that we need, and, in the process, create millions of new productive jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we must end the greed and selfishness that the current banking system and the leaders of our banking system are presently functioning with.

AMERICAN WORKERS NEED ASSISTANCE

(Mr. APPELGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, when, oh when, are we going to wise up

in this country? The President of the United States says we are going out of a recession. I have to say to the President of the United States, come to Ohio, come to eastern Ohio, come to Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, or Massachusetts. Come to the northeast quadrant of the United States and look at our jobs leaving. Look at our industries. They are leaving.

The President is giving away our jobs. He is giving away our industry, through bad trade policy and through foreign aid.

People of my district say they want this to stop. He is more interested in helping the other economies of the world, and then he does not want to help America's ex-workers by allowing them a little bit of additional unemployment compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this: My people do not want unemployment compensation. They want to work. They want jobs, they want industry, and they want to keep them in the United States, not send them out of the United States.

I will say this: That if we in Congress and those in the White House do not get our heads screwed on right, the people next year are going to screw us right out of office.

PROVIDE PEOPLE WITH NECESSARY INFORMATION CONCERNING ALCOHOL

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Antonia Novella, the Surgeon General of the United States, released a report which indicated that underage drinking is rampant in America. According to Dr. Novella, the minimum drinking age is largely a myth since State laws designed to enforce it are riddled with loopholes or not enforced. As a result, some 7 million teenage boys and girls have been able to purchase liquor for themselves. And while stronger enforcement of minimum age laws is part of the solution, it is only a piece of a much larger puzzle.

The fact is that 90 percent of high school students have tried alcohol; 4.5 million teenagers have serious drinking problems. Half of all motor vehicle accidents, homicides and suicides are alcohol related.

While we spend \$11 billion each year to fight the war on drugs, the industry spends billions of dollars to promote the so-called good life through alcohol use, despite the fact that alcohol kills three times as many Americans as crack, heroin, cocaine, and all other drugs combined.

Many people find out far too late that the quick road to success is just a fast trip to nowhere. Yet our Govern-

ment spends only \$200 million a year on alcohol abuse programs; \$11 billion for drugs, and \$200 million for alcohol? Come on, America; alcohol is a drug.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for us to provide some balance to the thousands of irresponsible ads which glamorize the use of alcohol. That is why I introduced H.R. 1443, the Safe Act, earlier this year. This bill would require advertisers to place one of five rotating warning messages at the end of their ads.

Before any more of our young people are lured to finding success at the bottom of a bottle, let us provide them with the information they need to make the right choice.

UNSAVORY JAPANESE BUSINESS PRACTICES

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a vivid example of Japan's subtle and sometimes not subtle methods of undermining U.S. trade policy during the ongoing United States-Japan auto negotiations.

□ 1310

On August 28 I was contacted by a law firm representing Mazda. Because of the congressional political pressure finally being exerted in response to Japan's exclusionary and protectionist automotive and auto parts trade practices, Mazda wants to diffuse the pressure during the negotiations by taking a handful of United States auto suppliers into its family of suppliers.

Now most people would probably say, "Marcy, isn't this what you have been trying to achieve all along?" Not exactly, I must respond. Let me explain.

What this attorney asked for were the names of those U.S. suppliers, "most politically active" so that Mazda can get the most political credit for taking them on. He actually said so.

This is a very blatant practice of throwing crumbs to a few companies in order to get them to stop speaking out about the exclusionary practices of Japanese auto companies and their plants toward the United States industry as a whole.

I ask my colleagues, is this what we have been fighting for so long, to have a few politically influential companies bought off in exchange for our silence? This is maybe how it is done in Japan, but unsavory business practices are not slipping by unnoticed by this Congresswoman.

CONGRATULATIONS TO 1991 KEIZER, OR, MAJOR GIRLS' SOFTBALL TEAM

(Mr. KOPETSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of good that goes on in our country, and today I rise to congratulate the Keizer, OR, girls' softball team, one of the best Little League teams in America.

This team ended a great season with a 16 and 4 record. Then they took the western championship, and then took this tenacity and spirit to the Little League World Series in Kalamazoo, MI. In Kalamazoo they captured third place in the world, best in the West, third in the world and first in our hearts.

These young ladies proved that commitment and dedication is the key to success whether on the sports field or off the sports field. These young ladies can truly carry their heads high with pride in their accomplishments.

This past summer's leadership, pride and teamwork shown by these young ladies reflects the same qualities in their hometown of Keizer, and indeed of all small towns throughout the great State of Oregon.

As many of the smaller communities throughout the Fifth District of Oregon face the challenges and uncertainties which lie ahead, these young ladies on this team provided an example of those qualities which do ensure success in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to represent these young ladies.

I include for the RECORD the names of the players, coaches, and staff of this inspirational team, as follows:

They are Nikki Arrington, Brianne Beaty, Traci Hearn, Tanya Heyko, Sara Koski, Michelle Lackaff, Nikki Lackaff, Amber Lee, Melinda Pacholl, Michelle Penn, Heidi Priem, Amanda Rawlins, Crissy Sjolander, Allison Williams—players, Joyce Tracewell—coach, Phil Lackaff—manager.

NO CONNECTION BETWEEN U.S. LOAN GUARANTEES AND THE PEACE PROCESS

(Mr. OWENS of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome those hundreds of activists participating in today's National Leadership Action Day to support absorption loan guarantees for Soviet Jews. Your arrival could not be more timely.

In the last few weeks, the President has stated his opposition to upcoming congressional action on the loan guarantee issue. He has gone so far as to formally ask that Congress defer Israel's request. But Mr. Speaker, by asking for a deferral on the eve of the historic Arab-Israeli peace conference, he is risking the creation of a whole new debilitating distraction. It can kill the peace conference before it begins.

Any further delay in providing Israel with loan guarantees will be very hurtful to Israel's effort to provide food, clothing, housing, and infrastructure development for the hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews escaping danger and uncertainty in the Soviet Republics. But more relevant to my point, the symbolism of deferral would create political conditions in Israel which could preclude Israel's participation in the conference at all.

There is no connection between U.S. loan guarantees and the peace process. Secretary Baker deserves great credit for the fact that all relevant Middle East leaders have already agreed to participate in the peace conference without preconditions. Why does the administration want to add a whole new factor, a new roadblock? Why cannot the President and the Secretary of State take yes for an answer?

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 219 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 219

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2967) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; to authorize a 1993 National Conference on Aging; to amend the Native Americans Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered by title instead of by section and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and any member may demand a separate vote on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 219 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The rule waives clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI against consideration of the bill. This clause requires that the report on any measure reported by a committee must be available to Members for 3 calendar days prior to consideration in the House. The waiver for H.R. 2967 is necessary because the accompanying report, although ordered reported on August 30 of this year, was not able to be filed until this past Wednesday, when the House returned from its August district work period.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute, the text of which is printed in the report accompanying the rule, as an original bill for the purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule. This substitute is virtually identical to the text ordered reported on July 30, 1991, by the Committee on Education and Labor. The substitute is amendable by titles, and each title shall be considered as having been read. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2967 is an extremely important piece of legislation, reauthorizing the Older Americans Act of 1965 for 4 years, through fiscal year 1995. This act is the major Federal vehicle for the development, coordination, and delivery of programs and services to meet the needs of our Nation's elderly. Although the program targets those older Americans with limited financial resources, it also reaches out to the frail elderly who are isolated from the rest of society and in desperate need of support services. For over a quarter of a century this act, through a network of over 25,000 service providers, has served hundreds of millions of home-delivered and congregate meals, offered community service employment opportunities to low-income elderly, and offered a wide range of support services for older Americans. H.R. 2967 will continue these critical services as well as adapt and expand its network of activities to meet the needs of our growing senior population. I urge adoption of this open rule, which was approved unanimously in the Rules Committee, so that we

may move on to prompt consideration and passage of H.R. 2967.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and honored today to join with my colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT], in urging Members to vote for this rule and to vote for the bill. We have before us an open rule that fully protects the rights of the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The Education and Labor Committee is to be commended for requesting an open rule, as is the House Rules Committee for reporting one.

□ 1320

I also want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], for their excellent work on this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the Older Americans Act is one of the finest Federal programs that we have, I would like to take just a couple of minutes to express some of my own thoughts about the bill.

Mr. Speaker, since its creation in 1965, the Older Americans Act has been considered one of the best, if not the best, Federal program in existence. Although older people receive services under many other Federal programs, this act is the major vehicle for the organization and delivery of supportive nutrition and other social services to our older people.

The last time Congress reauthorized this bill, the Older Americans Act, I think was in 1987, and the act was expanded to include several new programs for the frail and the abused elderly as well as ombudsman services for long-term care and elderly outreach services. The 1991 reauthorization bill also contains some important programs, expansions which I was glad to see in the bill, which will improve the role and the administration of the act itself.

The authority of the Commissioner on Aging will be strengthened and staffing will be increased for the Administration on Aging. But even so, it will still leave this program with one of the lowest administrative costs of all Federal programs, and again that is why I commend the committee for producing this piece of legislation.

There will be an increased emphasis on coordinating services at the State and local levels to assist older individuals and stepped-up efforts to increase the training and counseling services for older workers. There will be funds for supportive activities for caregivers who provide in-home services to frail

older individuals, and I think that is terribly, terribly important, and there will be an expansion for disease prevention and health promotion programs.

Among the truly most important programs to be improved and expanded, however, are the nutrition services. In fact, nutrition programs represent 66 percent of the bill's total funding. In 1990 alone, some 7 million people were served 240 million meals and I think that is just outstanding. We all know how important the Meals on Wheels Program is to our elderly.

The bill also makes grants available to the States for establishing a program of hot meals for multigenerational activities and social and recreational activities for the elderly, and elementary, and secondary schools. I think that tying that in without RSV programs is really going in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, it is only right that such an important piece of legislation be considered under an open rule so that this entire body can work its will. Again, I commend the Committee on Rules for the open-rule process, and I would urge support for the rule. I also urge support for this vital, vital piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking Republican on the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2967 and to urge its prompt adoption. Twenty-six years ago, the Congress created this program to give our senior citizens the supportive services they need to lead independent lives in their homes and communities. The bill before us today presents an opportunity to build on a quarter century of progress toward the goal of the act.

Since its creation, the Older Americans Act has been the primary vehicle for organizing and delivering social services to our Nation's older citizens, and by all accounts it has been a highly successful effort. The act has been responsible for building a nationwide network of 670 area agencies on aging, which have become the primary advocates and coordinators of service for our senior citizens.

Federal funding for OAA programs has also generated growing financial support for senior programs from State and local governments. When OAA programs began, Federal funding represented nearly 90 percent of the total resources devoted to supportive programs for the elderly. Since that time, State and local participation has increased dramatically. In 1990, almost 50 percent of OAA program funds were contributed by State, county, and city governments.

Today, the OAA programs face a critical challenge. A growing population of senior citizens has generated increased

demand for services, particularly in the area of in-home supportive care. We all recognize the importance of maintaining older persons in their own communities. In most cases, the quality of their lives, as well as the welfare of the community, are significantly enhanced by the contributions they are able to make. But financing and supply of in-home services have not kept pace with demand. Many States report lengthy waiting lists for long-term care programs and in some areas, very few such services are available at all. These program gaps make it all the more important for services to be coordinated and delivered in the most efficient way possible. The OAA network agencies play an important role as advocates for, and coordinators of, these vital services.

The bill before us today authorizes a \$200 million increase in resources that we hope will strengthen the aging network's ability to respond to the growing demands it faces. With the exception of a controversial provision on the White House Conference on Aging, the bill enjoyed bipartisan support within the Committee on Education and Labor. The issue of the White House conference has been resolved. The en bloc amendment that will be offered today reflects an agreement worked out by the White House and the committee over the past month. With incorporation of this amendment, the administration supports passage of the bill.

As a final note, I would like to commend the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MARTINEZ, and our chairman, Mr. FORD, for his leadership on this bill and for his bipartisan efforts on behalf of our Nation's older citizens.

I would also like to thank the staffs on both sides for their work.

The fine job that is performed in my 19th District by the area agencies on aging in York, Adams, and Cumberland Counties has proven a great assistance to my many senior citizens.

The Volunteer Service Credit Act was part of our legislation back in 1988. I was an original cosponsor of the bill offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], when this provision was added.

The amendment now, the en bloc amendments, will make it mandatory, and so we will now have additional incentive for volunteers and a way of paying back the volunteer efforts currently taking place.

Again, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members have heard from both the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York, there is bipar-

tisan agreement and support for both the bill and for the process by which we will consider this bill on the floor.

I would ask that my colleagues support the previous question on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 219 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2967.

□ 1330

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2967) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; to authorize a 1993 national conference on aging; to amend the Native Americans Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; and for other purposes, with Mrs. PATTERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start out by saying that it is with a great deal of pleasure that I am here today to amend the Older Americans Act and its reauthorization and continue the recognition of our responsibility to the elderly of our Nation.

As we look to the end of this century and into the year 2000, we come face to face with the overwhelming needs of a graying America. As we plan for the forthcoming millennium, the increase of older individuals compels us to develop a comprehensive response to the modern needs of our citizens.

Fortunately, the Older Americans Act which was passed, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] said, in 1965, 26 years ago, continues to adapt to the needs of our senior citizens and it is one that we need to reauthorize again now.

The Older Americans Act programs and funding have been the lifeblood to our communities, assisting the poor, the vulnerable, and the isolated.

The 1991 amendments will renew authority for the act for an additional 4

years, and attempts to look ahead to the needs of the older individuals in the years ahead. For that reason, we have devised improvements in the delivery system of the act along with an authorization to meet new program demands.

The amendments give the Commissioner on Aging, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has said, authority to control the administration's budget and personnel. It increases staffing levels to administer the program. It improves data collection to enhance monitoring and targeting efforts, and requires specific evaluations to improve the effectiveness of programs and forge new coordination of services in the program.

In addition, services to assist older individuals for health prevention, nutrition quality enhancement, elder abuse, legal assistance, language assistance, and intergenerational activities were added.

And, for the first time, the amendment makes Congress and the private sector equal policy participants with the administration in the White House Conference on Aging. The joining together of two branches of Government, along with private sector participants, to set the aging policy for the Nation for the next 10 years is a historical precedent.

The aging community is excited about a meaningful conference with a likelihood of congressionally mandated policy outcomes. We have the mutual support of members on both sides of the aisle for the innovative conference approach we have added.

The amendments also include a 4-year renewal of the Native American Program's authority. The well-regarded HHS Native American Program, currently funded at \$30 million, makes grants to Indian tribes to assist their development toward economic and social self-sufficiency.

It is my greatest hope that we have improved the Older Americans Act programs to effect the true fulfillment of our Nation's citizens in the golden years of their lives. Communities are where we begin and win the fight for quality in the life of all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of the Older Americans Act.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague next door, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who has an interest in a section of this bill.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to express my gratitude to the gentleman from California and his staff for helping me throughout long months of deliberation on one aspect of the bill that is before us, and to his predecessor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and

to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] who all played a part in my little portion of the world of the Older Americans Act. That portion, Madam Chairman, has to do with a spectacle that appeared on the television screens of every home in America a few years back when a 92-year-old lady was being forcibly evicted from her home in Pennsylvania for failure to pay taxes on her property. The spectacle of husky men dragging this 92-year-old lady out of that house triggered a whole series of meetings and action which finally resulted in this moment on the floor of the House.

We developed legislation right from the start and brought it to the attention of the relevant committees and committee chairmen to try to forever rid our Nation of the possibility of a person over 65 years of age being forcibly evicted from their residences, for whatever reason.

Now, this does not mean that failure to pay taxes or failure to pay rent or to pay a mortgage will be forgiven and that person will forever be allowed to remain in that residence; but rather, we want a system whereby when a person is about to be evicted that filing papers for that cause would result in notification to the local department of aging, the area agency for aging, if you will, who will then be able to spring to the side of this unfortunate individual and guide the next portion of that life through a transition to better housing, alternative housing, or somehow to make up the rent or mortgage payment that caused the eviction in the first place.

What this legislation provides and for which I am grateful is a demonstration project that will permit States to put into effect some kind of free, as we call it, foreclosure relief effort for the elderly, so that never again will we have in our country once this becomes law across the land that awful tragic view of an older person being thrown out of one's residence.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for giving me this opportunity. I also would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him and Chairman FORD and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for the fine work they have done on this authorization of the Older Americans Act.

All of us, fortunately, have been the beneficiaries of seeing this act give opportunities to senior citizens that they have not had prior to the act, whether it is title V of the Older Americans Act or any other of the myriad provisions.

I serve as chairman of the Human Services Subcommittee of the Commit-

tee on Aging. I see the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] who is the ranking member. We have had eight hearings on the reauthorization of this act.

I am particularly pleased to note that the chairman has been receptive to a number of the recommendations of the subcommittee that myself and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] have been involved in.

In particular, H.R. 1504, which is the bill to create a National Conference on Aging, most of us were very concerned that the White House did not convene the 1991 Conference on Aging, and now because of the fine work of the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and his subcommittee, the Congress is going to play a much more important role in convening this Commission, and I think that is all to the good.

Also, along with Congressman MILLER, title III(b) of this bill reflects a concern that I and others have had about a person who receives home health aid services, that these people be subject and allowed the same standards of supervision, training, and certification, which apply to a Medicare program.

This is an extraordinarily positive and important development, as are many of the other important changes that the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] has brought here, and the gentleman is to be congratulated and commended.

It is my hope, and I plan on working with the gentleman in the future to make sure that the provisions of this act are properly funded.

If we were to pay more attention to home health aid, if we were to provide more money there, we would save this country hundreds of millions of dollars and the suffering would be dramatically reduced for many tens of thousands of our elderly citizens. I want again to congratulate the gentleman for the fine work he has done.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not commend the gentleman from New York for his hard work and diligence and being an original cosponsor of this bill. Again I thank the gentleman from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Chairman, I also thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], a very important member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2967. This bill continues the tradition of providing high-quality services to meet the needs of our frail and elderly citizens.

Nebraska receives nearly half its funding for elderly services from this act. Thanks to the great volunteers and tireless employees who provide these services, Nebraska's elderly are receiving better attention than ever before because of the Older Americans Act.

Thankfully, the members of the Education and Labor Committee saw fit to accept an amendment from our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] to restore \$39 million to the authorization level for supportive services, like senior citizen centers.

Madam Chairman, when the population of elderly in this country is increasing, we cannot send signals to the elderly community that our commitment to helping them cope and remain independent, during the final years of their lives is on the wane.

By restoring the \$39 million authorization, I know that the communities throughout the Nation will be heartened to see these funds restored, and that our commitment caring for the well-being of our elderly community is still very strong.

And indeed we should be doing more to help the elderly.

However, a mechanism that could help those who aren't getting the needed services and meals was not included in the bill. And that's the idea of voluntary cost-sharing.

Currently 38 States use voluntary cost-sharing for congregate meals; meaning that senior citizens can volunteer to declare their income, and then be charged on a sliding-fee schedule for the meals they receive.

When asked by the General Accounting Office, and in a separate report by the inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services, an overwhelming number of senior citizens said they liked cost sharing because they liked paying something for the services that they receive.

But my concern with cost sharing, in no way should detract from the yeoman's job Subcommittee Chairman MARTINEZ and ranking member FAWELL have done on this bill.

I know our senior citizens will greatly benefit from their tireless efforts to insure that the elderly receive the best service possible.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI].

Mr. GUARINI. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and especially the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for their vision, leadership, and the view that they have

had toward reshaping the Older Americans Act. I find this very timely and very critical at this point of our history.

Madam Chairman, finding quality, affordable child care is tough on the average American. This problem will get worse unless we act now.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 1822, the Older Americans Child Care Employment Amendments of 1991. My bill could match up millions of children in need of day care with millions of Americans who can provide that care. It does this by creating a nationwide program of day care centers staffed by elderly Americans.

Older Americans—many of whom have raised families of their own—are well-suited to offer the love, care, and guidance so urgently needed by young children. My bill would also give older Americans the opportunity to earn extra money, while at the same time sharing their experience and knowledge with others.

Today, we are considering the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act of 1965. That bill—which has my full support—authorizes many important programs for senior citizens, and is an excellent bill in its own right. I am pleased to say that provisions of my bill have been incorporated into the Older Americans Act reauthorization.

Under the new provisions from this bill in the Older Americans Act, the commissioner on aging will set up demonstration project grants for multigenerational activities. Seniors will be able to get involved in child care, day care, educational assistance, family support programs, and juvenile delinquency treatment. This will allow seniors the opportunity that many of them seek to stay intimately involved in their community. The result: Senior citizens are earning money while helping working American families and children cope with many of the difficulties they face.

Madam Chairman, I am proud that this important project is on its way to passage. Given the chance, I believe that this initiative can flower into a nationwide movement employing tens of thousands of older Americans and eliminating the shortage we have throughout our Nation of quality day care.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in favor of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. I commend the efforts of the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. FORD, and the ranking minority member of the full committee, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. FAWELL in producing a bill that provides various services

that enable our Nation's seniors to live and work independently.

The Older Americans Act is currently celebrating its 26th anniversary. Since its inception in 1965, the Older Americans Act has focused on the health, legal, and employment needs of our senior citizens. Some of the specific program highlights include: in-home service for frail elderly, home health services, coordination of community-based long-term care services, development of elder abuse prevention programs, training of individuals for employment opportunities in private industry, and providing home delivered meals to our more vulnerable seniors.

One example illustrating the effectiveness of the Older Americans Act is title III of the Older Americans Act that funds the home-delivered meals program. In Wisconsin, the nutrition program has served as the foundation for many seniors' programs. In 1990, western Wisconsin's 169 meals sites served over 1 million meals to seniors in 19 counties. In the bill that is before this Chamber, authorization for the home-delivered meals program has been increased from slightly over \$79 million to \$120 million for fiscal year 1992.

Another outstanding program authorized under the Older Americans Act is the Senior Community Service Employment Program. This program provides subsidized, part-time employment to low-income seniors age 55 and older. H.R. 2967 authorizes over \$470 million for the Senior Community Service Employment Program. The program is currently being funded at \$390 million. In recent years, the program has also undertaken the goal of placing participants into unsubsidized employment opportunities. In 1990, more than 24 percent of program participants were placed into unsubsidized jobs. Under the Senior Community Service Employment Program, participants work 20 hours per week and are employed in community service activities such as home health care agencies and adult day care facilities.

Over the past 26 years, the Senior Community Service Employment Program has provided employment to over 10,000 individuals in Wisconsin. In my home county of Trempealeau, seniors employed in the Senior Community Service Employment Program have worked on various landscaping and construction activities for the Osseo-Fairchild School District and for my hometown of Pleasantville.

Another important component of the Older Americans Act is the White House Conference on Aging. In the original bill that was passed by the Education and Labor Committee, the White House Conference on Aging was changed to a National Conference on Aging. After several weeks of negotiations, I am very pleased that one of the amendments offered in block will be to

restore the White House Conference on Aging. I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman FORD and his staff, especially Gene Sofer, Bill Goodling, Harris Fawell, and Mary Ann Chaffee from the minority staff, for working with me on this important issue.

The White House Conference on Aging was first created by Congress in 1958. Representative John Fogarty of Rhode Island was the chief sponsor. The bill came before this body in July 1958. During floor debate both Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Bosch, of New York, said that they envisioned a conference as a means of bringing recommendations from the States together. These recommendations would then be transformed into a program of guidance for government and non-government entities at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Three White House Conference on Aging have been held since the original legislation was enacted. Those conferences have produced recommendations that have played a large role in giving birth to the Older Americans Act, improving health care services for our seniors, providing employment opportunities, and developing community service programs that will make, as stated in the 1961 Report of the White House Conference on Aging, "the gift of added years of life a period of reward and satisfaction." I am confident that the next White House Conference on Aging, which will be held in 1993, will continue the spirit of the 1961 conference.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I would like to applaud the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for their efforts in bringing this vitally important bill to the floor today.

For over a quarter century, the Older Americans Act has been providing older individuals with both the resources and the opportunities so that they are better able to help themselves. Passage of this reauthorization will support the efforts of the 80-year-old woman in my district who delivers meals to persons who are too frail to prepare their own food. It will continue the important work of a nursing home ombudsman who takes the time to look into the needs of a stroke victim. And it will play a significant preventative role in cost effectively assisting persons in their communities during a time of rapidly increasing health care costs.

It is for this reason that I introduced H.R. 2393, the Older Americans Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Act. This act, which has been incorporated

into both the House and Senate versions of this reauthorization, will expand the preventive health services program to include disease prevention and health promotion services. By providing these services at senior centers throughout the country, I firmly believe we will improve the quality of life for tens of thousands of older Americans and save millions of dollars through education and early detection of health care problems.

One of the Older Americans Act's greatest strengths is that it is comprised of a strong coordinated national network which is flexible enough to develop services to meet local needs. H.R. 2967 continues this tradition by serving older persons with the greatest social and economic needs, while also playing a key preventive role by serving older persons in a variety of settings. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 1350

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the almost-ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. This important legislation reauthorizes the Older Americans Act, which is the major vehicle for the organization and delivery of vital social and nutritional services to America's senior citizens. As the only Federal categorical program solely focused on these service needs, the importance of the Older Americans Act is unquestioned.

To many older Americans, the Older Americans Act means Meals on Wheels. But in addition to home delivered meals, the act provides for the delivery of nutritional services in congregate meal settings; sets up a new school-based program to provide hot meals to seniors; and increases reimbursement under the surplus commodities program.

For others, the Older Americans Act means the local senior center. It is in-home access and legal services, in-home care for the frail elderly, and disease prevention and health promotion activities.

For thousands of low-income persons over the age of 55, the Older Americans Act means financial independence through the community services employment program. The program provides subsidized, part-time employment, with an emphasis on the provision of services to other seniors. Participants are employed by day care centers, schools, and hospitals, and are provided with personal and job-related counseling, annual physical exams, and job training. Furthermore, from 20 to 25 percent of those leaving the program each year are successfully channeled into unsubsidized employment.

Today's bill means increased protection for America's seniors through State long-term care ombudsman programs, a new Office of Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman, the new National Ombudsman Resource Center, direct funding for the prevention of elder abuse and exploitation, and a new foreclosure and eviction assistance program.

For native Americans, native Hawaiians, Alaskan Natives, and Pacific Islanders, this bill today means an increased opportunity for self-sufficiency.

The programs packaged together in this act are of vital importance to the well being of American's seniors, providing nutrition, social services, and job opportunities. The issues that have surfaced during the reauthorization debate have illustrated the differences in some of our perspectives, but have also served to highlight our common goal: to ensure that America's older citizens continue to be well served by the Older Americans Act.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Human Resources, for his work on this bill, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California. In addition, I would like to thank the ranking member and the chairman of the full Education and Labor Committee for their expedited consideration of H.R. 2967, and for their efforts in bringing the bill to the floor today.

Simply stated, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991 means dignity and independence for millions of America's senior citizens. I am pleased to speak out in support of this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to secure for our older citizens the invaluable benefits of dignity and independence.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Madam Chairman, I want to, first of all, compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for their leadership on this very, very important issue. It is really the lifeblood bill in many ways for senior citizens, and they have done a tremendous job in assuring people that they can get services, et cetera, the meals, and the employment programs. The health, vitality, and independence of older Americans are assured.

I also want to pay tribute to the chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], who has had, as kind of a support to the Committee on Education and Labor, many, many hearings on many issues related to the elderly. I say to them, "I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for putting in a piece of legislation that I

introduced 10 years ago and had the support of the then late great Claude Pepper related to elder abuse."

Madam Chairman, 10 years ago there were about a million older Americans who could be documented as being abused. Today there are 1.5 million Americans who can be documented as being abused. Yet we never really addressed, as we had with child abuse, in spousal abuse, the problem of elderly abuse. Maybe it is because we did not want to admit that in fact older Americans are very often abused. They are abused physically, they are abused psychologically, and very often they are abused, unfortunately, by their loved ones.

Madam Chairman, I believe that this legislation, the Older Americans Act, which for the first time will have a major provision related to elder abuse, to conduct the research, disseminate information, have the clearinghouse that we have for child abuse problems, authorizes funding for State grants, and demonstration projects and training for individuals who work with the elderly, will be a very, very positive step in addressing what has been a national disgrace and a national shame. It is really a shame that in a way we have seen 15 to 20 million more Americans in that decade period be abused that may have been assisted by this legislation.

However, Madam Chairman, the fact is that we have it now thanks to the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the pushing by my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], for including this in the Older Americans Act. The Committee on Energy and Commerce was very gracious. I believe, in yielding to the Committee on Education and Labor on this because there were certain provisions; and I am very, very grateful.

Let us hope that we will see an end to elder abuse, and I am grateful, once again, for my legislation being included in the Older Americans Act.

Chairman FORD, subcommittee Chairman MARTINEZ, I would like to begin by commending you both for continued outstanding leadership in public policy as it relates to the quality of life of older Americans. The bill before us today provides for the continuation of a number of services which are vital to our senior citizens. These include supportive services, congregate and home delivered meals, the community service employment programs, and other initiatives dedicated to maintaining the health, vitality, and independence of older Americans. Current statistics indicate that malnutrition has been reported in 52 to 85 percent of all long-term care patients, and the focus of H.R. 2967 on nutrition among the elderly comes at a very critical time.

Madam Chairman, I must especially thank you and Mr. MARTINEZ for adopting the critical provisions of my legislation, H.R. 385, the Elder Abuse Prevention, Identification, and

Treatment Act of 1991. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman ROYBAL, who has always displayed tremendous leadership on these issues and also worked on this bill.

I am now closer than ever to seeing the completion of my 10-year effort, which I began with the support of our late colleague, Senator Claude Pepper, who first coined the term "elder abuse." Over a decade has passed since the Aging Committee's first report on the problem, which called for the passage of my legislation. Last year, a new report, issued under the leadership of our Aging Committee Chairman ROYBAL, found that since that first committee report, the incidence of elder abuse has increased 50 percent. In the 10 years it has taken to get this bill enacted there have been 10–15 million cases of elder abuse in the United States.

H.R. 2967 and the Senate companion, together, contain all of the essential provisions of my legislation, H.R. 385. As I have mentioned, my legislation is patterned after very successful Federal programs which address the terrible problem of child abuse. H.R. 2967 includes the language of my bill which calls for the creation of a National Center on Elder Abuse to conduct research and disseminate information to the States on all aspects of the problem. The bill before us authorizes funding for State grants and demonstration projects to address the problem of elder abuse, which, like child abuse, occurs most often not in institutional settings but in the home. Grant funding will be used in a comprehensive effort to promote coordination among State and local authorities, social workers, and health professionals who are in a position to prevent, identify, or treat the problem. The funding will also be available for training programs that give such people the tools they need to prevent elder abuse from occurring, identify the problem when it does occur, and to assist those who are affected.

It is difficult to believe that this problem is so prevalent in our Nation—we hate to even think about it. Yet, an estimated 1.5 million cases occurred in the United States last year. One out of every 20 older Americans fell prey to some form of serious abuse or neglect. It is an even greater shame that while only one out of every three child abuse cases is reported every year, only one out of every eight elder abuse cases gets reported to the proper authorities.

Madam Chairman, this is truly a watershed day for the victims of elder abuse, fraud, and neglect in the United States. Again, Chairman FORD, H.R. 2967 is a tribute to your continued concern for the quality of life of the Nation's senior citizens. This is consistent with all of the great work we have done together on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of our Nation's Federal retirees.

I repeat my thanks to you, to Mr. MARTINEZ of California, House Aging Committee Chairman ROYBAL, and the entire Education and Labor Committee for this excellent bill before us today. I must also thank all those who have cosponsored my legislation, H.R. 385. I would also like to thank our distinguished colleagues in the other body, Senator DENNIS DECONCINI and Senator BROCK ADAMS, for putting this elder abuse legislation in the companion vehi-

cle. I support the entire bill and I urge passage of this critical legislation.

FACTS AND STATISTICS ON ELDER ABUSE

The victims of elder abuse are likely to be old, age 75 or older.

Women are more likely to be abused than men. This is due, in part to their life expectancy. Women, on average, live longer than men.

The victims are generally in a position of dependency.

The abused elder is less likely to report the incident of abuse than abused persons in other age groups.

Since the release of the Aging Committee's first report on elder abuse in 1981, the percentage of elder abuse cases reported has decreased from one in six to one in eight.

43 States and D.C. have what they consider to be adult protective service laws which require mandatory reporting of abuse. However, there is little consistency among States as to penalties and who is required to report.

While some 40 percent of all required abuse involve adults and elderly adults, only 4 percent of State budgets for protective services are committed to elderly protective services. The average state expenditure was \$3.80 per elderly resident.

Some 70 percent of all adult abuse reported annually involve elderly victims.

About 5 percent of the nation's elderly may be the victim of some form of abuse—physical, financial, or emotional, each year. About 1,500,000 older Americans are abused by family, loved ones and caregivers each year.

Since 1981, the primary source of Federal funding for protective services, the Social Services Block Grant, has been cut in real terms one-third by direct cuts and inflation.

The types of physical abuse include deliberate physical injury, sexual abuse and negligence. Other forms of abuse include financial abuse, psychological and emotional abuse.

Common profiles of elder abusers—Experiencing great stress due to alcoholism, drug addiction, marital problems, or long-term financial difficulties. The son of the victim is the most likely abuser, followed by the daughter of the abuser. It is apparent that the abused person is often ashamed to admit their child or loved ones abuse them and they often fear reprisals.

Most elder abuse occurs in the home setting.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES FACT SHEET—ELDER ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION IN OHIO

FACTS

9,178 elderly Ohioans were reported as having been abused, neglected, or exploited during the last twelve months (7/1/88–6/30/89).

Persons in need of protective services numbered 5,670.

3,021 were not in need of protective services, but may well have needed other support services provided through their county departments of human services.

Those in need of protective services but refusing the service totaled 826.

The county departments of human services handle abuse/neglect/exploitation reports and must begin an investigation of emergencies within 24 hours of their receipt.

Each of us has an obligation to help our older relatives, neighbors, and friends understand their options when they are subjected to abuse, neglect or exploitation.

Social, medical, and mental health care professionals are mandated by law to imme-

diately report suspected abuse, neglect, (including self-neglect) or exploitation to the county department of human services. Also required to report are attorneys, peace officers, senior service providers, coroners, clergymen and professional counselors. Any concerned citizen should report suspected situations of elder abuse, neglect, or exploitation to their county department of human services.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], the ranking member on the subcommittee which brings us this legislation.

Mr. FAWELL. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer my enthusiastic support for H.R. 2967 and to urge its prompt adoption. It has been a pleasure for me, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, to work with Chairman MARTINEZ as well as Chairman FORD and ranking member GOODLING, and to take part in reauthorization of this program which has been so successful and meant so much to our Nation's older citizens.

The bill before us today increases spending authority by over \$200 million, which translates to 12 percent growth in programs authorized by the Older Americans Act. It is an unfortunate fact of life, however, that current budget constraints and actual appropriations prevent us from increasing funding for OAA programs that would keep pace with inflation and the growth of our senior population.

Resource limitations make it all the more important for us to remain vigilant in ensuring that we reach those elderly persons with the greatest social and economic need. To that end, we have included provisions in H.R. 2967 that will improve program and demographic information so that our neediest senior citizens will have better access to the services they require.

I believe the bill focuses well on the need for better coordination of services for our older citizens, particularly those in need of long-term care services. We have heard testimony from a number of State officials and program managers who report long waiting lists for in-home supportive services such as homemaker assistance and adult day care. Our intent in this bill is to encourage maximum coordination of services so that network agencies can improve service delivery systems that are currently in place.

The bill also acknowledges the importance of prevention strategies to avoid the need for long-term care by authorizing a Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Program within senior centers throughout the country. At a time when burgeoning health care costs can impoverish our older citizens who suffer from chronic disease, it is important to emphasize the need for effective prevention services.

While I support the overall spirit of the bill and believe that certain new

provisions will improve the aging network's ability to serve our senior citizens, I am concerned about the number and array of new requirements that H.R. 2967 would impose on the Administration on Aging, which manages OAA programs. For instance, there are provisions to create new structures within AOA for ombudsman and elder abuse programs. I think these are laudable initiatives, but there is little gain in developing new systems if the resources and management structure and appropriations to support them are not in place. Unfortunately, that is the case.

The General Accounting Office has recently completed an evaluation that looked at AOA's ability to accomplish its current mission and objectives. Regrettably, the GAO found that AOA has been overwhelmed with increasing demand during a time when resources have actually been shrinking. During a hearing of the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Resources, of which I am a member, we heard strong testimony from GAO about AOA's inability to provide even minimum oversight and technical assistance for the basic programs they administer.

Yet H.R. 2967 will add a number of new grant authorities to this menu of basic programs. For example, once appropriations exceed 102 percent of the previous year's level, the bill authorizes a multigenerational meal program in school sites. I understand that programs like this one have been successful at the local level and have much to recommend them, but does it make sense to require AOA to carry out new programs when they are unable to oversee the basic nutrition services they have been charged to administer for the last 20 years?

Given the compelling evidence of an agency that is obviously overwhelmed with its current requirements, it is troubling that we are now proposing to increase those responsibilities when it is highly unlikely that resources will grow sufficiently to meet new demands. It seems to be that we would have been better served by ensuring that AOA is enabled to support the basic nutrition and social services that are the backbone of this act, rather than force an unfunded expansion of efforts. I hope that over the next years the committee will exercise its oversight role to ensure that AOA is not diverted further from its primary mission.

However, the pluses of this bill, of course, far outnumber the minuses. In closing, I would like to again commend Chairman MARTINEZ of the Human Resources Subcommittee and Chairman FORD and Ranking Member GOODLING for their help and leadership in forging the bill and for making it possible to craft a compromise bill that the administration can support. The en bloc

amendment that will be offered later includes language on the White House Conference on Aging that is acceptable to both the White House and the Committee. Chairman FORD's assistance, as well as Ranking Member GOODLING's, in that effort was particularly invaluable.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, before I yield time to the next speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources for his fine work, as well as the staff of the minority who did a great, great job.

Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], the chairman of the Select Committee on Aging.

□ 1400

Mr. ROYBAL. Madam Chairman, as chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, I rise in support of this most important piece of legislation. I think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come to the House this year.

I would like to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], and I compliment also the ranking minority member and their staffs for the wonderful job they have done in bringing this matter to the floor, particularly on this day, and for the time spent coordinating their activities with the Select Committee on Aging and presenting this important piece of legislation to the House.

The history of the Older Americans Act is one of great challenge, but it is also one of accomplishments, for this act has grown tremendously from its very inception, all due to the fact that this House and the Congress of the United States have reauthorized the act at least 12 times. I believe that each time the act has been improved, and it also has improved the ability of the aging network to deliver a full range of services to the older population.

To a frail, home-bound older person, the act may mean home-delivered meals, homemaker services, and transportation for medical appointments. To a low-income older worker, the Older Americans Act may mean a part-time, community service job under title V. For others who are isolated and lonely it can well mean meals, activities, and volunteer opportunities at senior centers—an important part of their lives.

The act as written provides elder abuse prevention, ombudsman programs, outreach and information and referral systems, health education and promotion—the list goes on. Clearly, the aging network has evolved into a sophisticated system in response to the ever changing needs of the elderly. Today, the Older Americans Act en-

compasses programs that were barely thought of in 1965, but which were developed as the aging community learned more about the aging process and the hopes and expectations of older Americans.

Throughout the last year the Select Committee on Aging reviewed the most recent proposals to amend the act and examined recent developments in the aging network. Many of the committee's recommendations are also included in this bill. I believe the provisions offered here today compliment and further clarify the purpose and intent of the act.

I am pleased to report that this bill includes many of the provisions of H.R. 2780, which my colleagues—the Honorable MATTHEW MARTINEZ, the Honorable MARY ROSE OAKAR, the Honorable RON WYDEN, the Honorable THOMAS DOWNEY, and the Honorable DALE KILDEE—and I recently introduced to provide a national response to abuse of our elderly in institutions and in their homes.

The Aging Committee found that the only active and effective advocate for the elderly residents of institutions in many States is the State long-term-care ombudsman. This program, however, has been woefully underfunded by the Federal Government, and its work in some instances is administratively hampered in the States. Recognizing that the incidence of abuse will continue to increase as the population ages, this bill will strengthen the ability of the State ombudsman to respond to abuse complaints expeditiously and without undue influence. This bill establishes within the Administration on Aging [AOA] an Office of the Long Term Care Ombudsman to advocate, monitor, and coordinate Federal and State long-term-care ombudsman activities.

Elderly abuse, neglect, and exploitation of elders living in their own homes is rampant. Efforts to address this kind of abuse by State adult protective service programs have proved inadequate; my colleague MARY ROSE OAKAR, has been the primary sponsor of legislation to put this program in place and I was pleased to join her in urging the placement of this program in the Older Americans Act.

Other provisions that the Select Committee on Aging has promoted and are included in the act are:

Under title III, translating services for elders with limited English-speaking ability.

The eligibility for those individuals, who under the Immigration Reform and Control Act [IRCA] of 1986, were granted resident status to participate in the programs under title V of the act.

In the area of housing for the elderly, area agencies on aging will work with nonprofit housing entities to develop access to services within the housing complex.

Heighten the distinction and effectiveness of the White House Conference on Aging by bringing both the legislative and the executive branches of Government and private individuals together for the first time in the history of the conference to formulate and establish comprehensive national policies for the older Americans.

Additionally, throughout the act key language has been inserted to promote and increase the services and the participation of elderly minorities and those of low income.

In short, these amendments provide greater focus in the act on the needs of the minorities and the frail and disabled elderly. I firmly believe that these amendments will enhance the aging network's ability to fulfill the critical role it now plays, and will increasingly play, in the lives of over 43 million Americans who are over the age of 60 and their families. I urge you to join me in supporting these amendments and demonstrating the Congress' commitment to a stronger older Americans Act and to the people it serves.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding this time to me.

Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to join my colleagues today in consideration of the House passage of the 1991 amendments for the 13th reauthorization of the Older Americans Act of 1965. We are reaffirming our commitment to this landmark legislation which provides the only national network of services to assist the older population in their own homes and communities.

The bill before us today is the product of an extensive legislative process. In February 1990, under the leadership of Chairman DOWNEY, the Select Committee on Aging's Human Services Subcommittee of which I am the ranking Republican member, began oversight hearings to begin the process in preparation for this year's reauthorization. Since then, States, local area agencies on aging, service providers, constituents, aging organizations, and the administration have all contributed recommendations to Congress for the 1991 amendments to the Older Americans Act. This has resulted in a bill which reflects their suggestions and concerns—and the growing needs of a rapidly aging population.

I want to commend my colleagues, Chairmen FORD and MARTINEZ, and ranking Republican members GOODLING and FAWELL, and their able staffs on the House Education and Labor Committee, and the Human Resources Subcommittee, for their fine work in negotiating and drafting this comprehensive bill. I also want to especially thank the committee members who were very responsive in incorporating into this reauthorization the language

and intent of a significant number of the nine bills which I introduced to amend the Older Americans Act.

These bills of mine addressed a wide range of concerns: Services for family caregivers, collaborative community efforts for eldercare, equity for rural elderly, coordination of transportation services and preventive health services for osteoporosis and medication management.

Caregivers, as I have seen through my years of work on this issue, are in great need of our support. Family members, primarily female, provide 80 percent of the care and assistance needed by the frail elderly. This care is critical in allowing older individuals to retain their dignity and independence by remaining in their own homes. Providing this care is usually very rewarding, but also can be extremely stressful. For instance, this summer I visited in the home of a family who was caring for a mother who had Alzheimer's disease. The woman who was the primary caregiver told me that 4 days a week of adult day care for her mother-in-law was a godsend as it gave her some relief and time to catch up on normal activities. I introduced legislation to address part of this problem, so I am very gratified that H.R. 2967 authorizes a new program of supportive services for caregivers.

Madam Chairman, today 1 of every 6 Americans is age 60 or older. By the year 2030, this proportion will increase to more than 1 of every 4. Such a dramatic population shift will greatly increase the need for home and community-based care and services for older persons who are at risk of losing their self-sufficiency. I am pleased that the bill we are considering today includes the intent of my bill to mobilize cooperative community efforts to develop additional activities and resources to meet the escalating needs of the frail elderly and their caregivers.

In my State of Maine, 18 percent of the population is age 60 and over. My district is the largest east of the Mississippi and it is predominantly rural. Unfortunately, rural areas receive short shrift in many Federal programs, including elder services. That's why I am very glad that H.R. 2967 includes the intent of the bill I introduced to require State formulas for distributing Older Americans Act funds to take into account rural individuals' access to services. This provision should help rebalance the allocation of funding within a State to reflect the cost of providing geographical access to services for older individuals living in rural areas.

Transportation is also crucial, particularly in rural areas, if older persons are to get to the services they need. Better State and community coordination and consolidation of transportation services for social service programs are essential to eliminate dupli-

cation and stretch scarce resources. H.R. 2967 reflects a bill of mine by requiring that State and area agency on aging coordinate transportation services.

I also, Madam Chairman, want to thank the committee for adding a waiver provision for additional authority to transfer funds between the congregate and home-delivered meals programs. Because of geography, lack of public transportation, and the needs of frail elders, Maine invests more in home-delivered meals than any other State since it is the most practical way to reach elderly in rural areas. This waiver, although it is capped, is important in preserving State flexibility to design services to meet the special needs of its older population.

H.R. 2967 greatly expands part F, disease prevention and health promotion services, based on the initiative of Representative LOWEY. This section also includes provisions which I introduced regarding osteoporosis, including fall and fracture prevention. It also has provisions for medication management screening and education to prevent incorrect medication and adverse drug reactions. These are two very serious but preventable conditions of many older Americans, often resulting in painful and costly consequences.

Through the years, a perennial concern of Older Americans Act reauthorizations has been the status of the Commissioner on Aging and the organizational structure of the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health and Human Services. In August 1990, I requested a comprehensive study by the General Accounting Office to address these issues, including the capability of the Administration on Aging to fulfill its mission. Based in large measure on that study, language is in this bill which greatly strengthens the role of the Commissioner and the Administration on Aging.

The study also documented the shortfalls of the Administration on Aging's current data collection system, so I am pleased that H.R. 2967, in response, requires uniform data collection procedures for use by State agencies. Uniform data collection methods are badly needed in order to obtain valid information for evaluating both the effectiveness of and need for services under the Older Americans Act.

The committee should also be praised for the bill's strong new elder rights sections, particularly for the elder abuse and State long-term care ombudsman provisions. The Nation's vulnerable elderly are entitled to protection from abusive action and my colleagues, Representatives DOWNEY and ROYBAL, are to be commended for their leadership in this area.

Madam Chairman, for 26 years the Older Americans Act has developed from a program of small grants to one which supports a national infrastruc-

ture of 57 State agencies on aging, 670 area agencies on aging, 25,000 service providers, and 194 Native American grantees. The mission and responsibilities of the act have evolved greatly and expanded through the years into an increasingly complex and sophisticated system of home and community-based support services. Hundreds of thousands of older individuals depend on Older Americans Act services to help retain their self-sufficiency—such as home-delivered meals, transportation to a doctor's appointment or help with household chores. In addition, the Older Americans Act funds important training, research and demonstration activities in the aging field, and supports a low-income older worker community service employment program. Finally, I'm pleased that the White House Conference on Aging will be convened in 1993.

Today, the Older Americans Act is truly an evolving legislative success story, and I am pleased to have played a role in the 1991 reauthorization.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for including in the committee's en bloc amendment the provision which would permit rural service participants in the congregate and home-delivered meals nutrition programs to serve fewer than five meals per week. Like the chairman, those of us in rural areas feel it would be ideal if all providers had the resources and ability to provide five meals a week. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, that is not always feasible in rural areas.

Madam Chairman, like the chairman of the subcommittee, our providers want to assist older Americans to the greatest degree possible. Our feeling is that even if five meals are not possible, two or three or four meals a week can do immeasurable good, both nutritionally and socially. The desire to accomplish all the good that we can with limited resources led us to request this provision within the committee amendment.

Madam Chairman, my understanding is that the language included in the amendment means that providers in rural areas who demonstrate the infeasibility of five meals per week will no longer be required to create paper bureaucracies to give the illusion of providing five meals, nor will they need to submit to the Federal Government a yearly waiver request to provide fewer than five meals per week. Is this understanding correct?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that clarification, and again, I commend him and the committee for their leadership in this bill.

□ 1410

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Madam Chairman, as we debate the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act of 1965, I rise to speak about the nutritional programs within the act that are near and dear to my heart. Adequate nutritional intake for the elderly is critical to their life and health. No other community service can make more of an impact toward the health and well-being of the elderly than nutritional services provided through such programs as the Older Americans Act.

Diseases commonly found in the older adult population that are possibly affected by diet include diabetes, hypertension, cardiovascular diseases, osteoporosis, and anemia. Increased research efforts have been targeted to identify the role of nutrition and diet in chronic disease prevention. However, after developing any one of these chronic diseases, and many elderly suffer from multiple chronic diseases, the need for food and nutrition in the form of diet therapy is now often used by the physician as the first method of treatment. If treatment is not successful with diet modifications alone, diet therapy becomes secondary only to drug therapy.

The importance of nutrition relative to well-being has been emphasized by many researchers and health professionals. Studies have shown that poor nutrition increases health problems, increases use of health care services, and thereby increases health care costs. In short, increased attention and resources paid toward the nutritional needs of older adults could very possibly contribute to a slowing in the rapid rise in future health care costs.

Recently compiled statistics from a preliminary evaluation of a community-based care demonstration project in Ohio, show that the No. 1 service needed and requested by the elderly is home delivered meals, and homemaker service—which can also include meal preparation. Adequate food and good nutritional status is critical to the life of the elderly, their health and their ability to stay in their home.

We talk about the independent elderly, usually referring to those who are not homebound, but let's not forget the numbers of elderly who even if they are functionally independent are not nutritionally independent. An Ohio survey found that the congregate meal is the only meal received by one-third of our elderly who participate in that program.

The demands for nutrition services placed on our service providers today are greater and often much different than 10 to 15 years ago. And the demands of the future will not diminish; they will not go away. We need Federal, State, and local nutrition program experts and lawmakers all sitting together at the nutrition policy and decisionmaking table to shape the plan for our nutrition programs for our elderly for the future.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], the ranking subcommittee member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], as well as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], for this great bill. I also want to give credit to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her efforts to protect the elderly from abuse, and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who has dealt with the specific issue of foreclosure for our seniors.

Madam Chairman, I rise today and would say that with some of the things we are talking about with the peace dividend, would also like to see us take a piece of advice from the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], and look at the notch baby issue, which is the No. 1 issue that seniors talk to me about in my district.

Madam Chairman, this is a great bill, and I really support it. I rise today in conjunction with this bill to pay tribute to the director of our area agency on aging who is retiring, Martha Murphy. She was always available, always had the time, and developed a coordinated delivery system, where seniors always had advocacy and were treated as they should be, with the type of priority they deserve. Martha was a bulldog, and it is going to be very, very hard to replace her in that position.

Madam Chairman, I think this is a tribute today to Martha Murphy and the efforts she has done, and to this particular committee, who has done a fine job in presenting us with a fine bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

Earlier this year, I testified before the Human Resources Subcommittee to request that the number of frail elderly individuals be a key factor when Older Americans Act funds are distributed throughout the States and I am pleased that the committee has agreed to in-

clude language in the bill to assist the frail elderly.

Pasco County and Pinellas County, FL, both located in my congressional district, together, have one of the highest concentrations of frail elderly individuals in the Nation. Over the past several years, I have become familiar with the lifestyles of the frail elderly who have difficulty in performing everyday tasks such as bathing, cooking, or cleaning. It is not uncommon for these seniors to depend heavily on family members.

In Florida, though, there are many disabled seniors living alone and desperately in need of assistance. Otherwise, they would face institutionalization, which is not only a financial drain on the individual but in many cases, on the American taxpayer as well.

In March 1990, the House Select Committee on Aging conducted a hearing in my congressional district to discuss the needs of the frail elderly. The general consensus of the hearing was this: If more Federal and State dollars were channeled to services such as Meals on Wheels, adult congregate dining and adult day care, more frail seniors could continue to live independently instead of spending the rest of their lives in a long-term care facility.

Under current law, each State is required to develop an intrastate funding formula for allocating Older Americans Act funds for its planning and service areas. The bill before us today requires that each State consider certain statistics on individuals over 60 years of age when developing the formula. The formula will be based on the number of low-income older individuals, low-income minority seniors, and frail elderly individuals that reside in the State.

In addition, it directs the Commissioner of the National Agency on Aging to carry out a program to provide supportive activities for family members or other caregivers who provide in-home services to frail older individuals. These programs may include training and counseling for caregivers, assistance in forming support groups for elderly caregivers and they may provide information on how to obtain in-home services and respite services.

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to subcommittee chairman MATTHEW MARTINEZ, ranking Republican HARRIS FAWELL, and Congressman TOM DOWNEY along with their fine staff members for their assistance regarding the frail elderly. I will continue to support their efforts on the Older Americans Act in order that seniors across the country will continue to reap the benefits of these essential programs and services.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2967,

which reauthorizes two important laws that affect two very special segments of our population—the Older Americans Act and the Native Americans Programs Act.

For over 25 years the Older Americans Act has helped provide essential nutritional, health, employment and support services that allow older Americans to lead healthy, fulfilling, independent lives.

Older Americans are an important part of the American community. Today there are over 41 million older Americans in our Nation, and the numbers are likely to increase in the future. Providing services such as in-home meals, recreational activities and part-time employment helps to ensure that the elderly of our Nation continue to be active participants in our communities.

H.R. 2967 reauthorizes the Older Americans Act for the next 3 years. It increases funding level for the act by 4.8 percent above the current \$1.7 billion to meet the rising demand for services among our Nation's elderly.

H.R. 2967 will continue such proven programs as Meals on Wheels and establishes new innovative opportunities, such as intergenerational programs that allow younger generations to interact with and learn from older Americans.

In line with the original purpose of the Older Americans Act this bill continues to focus efforts on serving the senior population in greatest social and economic need. Specifically changes have been made to ensure that minority individuals are adequately served, increase coordination of services at the State and local levels, enhance the coordination of employment training and supportive services and expand current disease prevention and health promotion services.

Madam Chairman, title VI of this bill is of particular importance to me because it provides grants for an important population of my constituency, native Hawaiians. Since 1989 native Hawaiians have received funding under the title VI of the Older Americans Act to provide statewide nutrition, health, education and support services for elderly native Hawaiians.

This program, known as Ke Ola Pono No Ka Kupuna [Good Health and Well Being for our Elders], provides services for 526 native Hawaiians, including traditional Hawaiian meals; culturally relevant recreation and health education programs; and information on social resources, legal services and general education.

Like many of the cultures that make up the American society, the Hawaiian culture reveres and honors its elders. The services provided through the Kupuna program in Hawaii allows the native Hawaiian elders to cope with the changes in their society and to pass along the traditional ways of the Hawaiian people to younger generations.

H.R. 2967 makes an important change in the funding mechanism in title VI to ensure that native Hawaiians will receive a fair share of the moneys under title VI. Under current law native Hawaiians are eligible for title VI funding only if the appropriations exceed fiscal year 1987 levels. Because of this conditional funding mechanism, 1989 was the first year that native Hawaiians were eligible for title VI funds. Without a stable funding formula it has been difficult to plan for continued and expanded programs in the native Hawaiian community.

This bill eliminates this unfair funding requirement and native Hawaiians will receive 10 percent of the title VI funds every year, regardless of appropriations level.

Madam Chairman, I am also in strong support of the reauthorization the Native Americans Programs Act, which provides important programs for the economic, social, and physical well-being of the native Hawaiian population in my State.

The Native Americans Programs Act offers grants and contracts to eligible native American and native Hawaiian entities to increase employment opportunities, business development, strengthening self-government and self-sufficiency, and for construction and renovation of housing units.

The changes offered here today strengthen the act by providing the native American and native Hawaiian organizations the desperately needed technical assistance to plan, implement and evaluate programs.

H.R. 2967 also strengthens some of the most successful programs under the act, including the native Hawaiian revolving loan fund, which provides loans for small businesses and enterprises in the native Hawaiian communities. First established in 1988 as a \$3 million demonstration project, the native Hawaiian revolving loan fund has provided the capital for 62 small businesses in the Hawaiian community, including a variety of enterprises from a music school production/promotion business to a poha berry farm.

H.R. 2967 makes the native Hawaiian revolving loan fund a permanent program under the Native Americans Programs Act and expands the loan to a \$5 million program by authorizing an additional \$1 million from the Federal Government and a matching \$1 million from the loan administrator.

Planting the seeds of growth and self-sufficiency in the native Hawaiian communities across our State, the native Hawaiian revolving loan fund is an outstanding example of how government can help people help themselves.

And Madam Chairman, that is the very goal of H.R. 2967, to assist and support the elderly and the native populations of our country to continue to be vital, productive, and an essential part of the American community.

I urge Members to vote for H.R. 2967.

□ 1420

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

Since 1965, older Americans have benefited greatly from the programs that are administered on the local level through, in New Jersey, the county offices on aging, and I am sure, around the country in agencies that mirror what we have in New Jersey.

The programs that have been administered that have been so beneficial include legal counsel, home delivered meals, employment counseling, and many other programs which are currently in place that have been a tremendous success.

During the past 5 weeks I have had the opportunity to spend an inordinate amount of time talking with older Americans, groups of older Americans, older Americans' organizations and representatives from the community generally. And to the extent that this bill expands those programs which are beneficial, I believe all of us should offer that much more support for it.

I in particular make reference to the provisions of the separate bill that was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], my good friend and colleague, and was pleased to become a cosponsor of his bill which provided for expansion of the Older Americans Act to provide programs in health-risk assessment, routine health screening, nutritional counseling and other items that are intended to maintain a good level of help and helpful programs for older Americans.

As has been pointed out by a number of previous speakers, these programs are not only helpful to individual members of the older American community, but are also of benefit to us all because the more we concentrate on keeping people healthy, the less we have to concentrate on funding those very expensive programs that are designed to help them after they have become less healthy.

To the extent that this bill includes those provisions, I offer my enthusiastic support.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to salute the gentleman and his colleagues in the committee for a job well done and to suggest that during the recess I was back home and met with the Forum on Older Persons' Issues for Louisville and Jefferson County. They were very much devoted to

the idea of reauthorizing the older Americans bill. They have many programs matching the ones authorized by this bill: job counseling programs, employment training programs and nutritional programs which, of course, are very important to senior citizens.

I was very happy to see in this bill a requirement, not just a calling but a requirement, that there be a White House Conference on Aging. Going back to the 1950's, when these conferences first began, from them have come Medicare, Medicaid, and the Older Americans Act itself. And I have reason to think that fruitful discussions held at the national level among people working with the senior citizens would be able to achieve, again, some ideas which could be implemented in the form of legislation.

So I am happy that the committee chose to require this conference and I salute the work that it has done on H.R. 2967 and certainly rise in behalf of the bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman MARTINEZ and ranking member FAWELL for the fine job that they have done in crafting a reauthorization bill that will truly be of great benefit to senior citizens all across this Nation.

This bill, H.R. 2967, of which I am an original cosponsor, will significantly strengthen the Older Americans Act by authorizing funding for successful existing programs and necessary new initiatives.

Throughout the entire reauthorization process, the chairman and ranking member's strong commitment to our Nation's senior citizens has been self-evident. The bill before us today clearly reflects their hard work and devotion to their cause, and I want to congratulate them for a job well done.

I am especially pleased that the bill incorporates several important new initiatives which I have advocated.

First, the bill includes the language of the Older Americans Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Act, H.R. 1739, which I introduced to significantly increase access to and participation in health promotion and disease prevention services.

The subcommittee's hearings made it clear that older Americans are able to benefit significantly from health promotion and disease prevention services. Moreover, at a time when health care costs continue to skyrocket, a strong emphasis on preventive health programs can cut health care costs significantly in the long run.

I believe the expansion of preventive health programs is an essential direction for the Older Americans Act to

take at the present time, and I am extremely pleased that this important initiative has been incorporated into H.R. 2967.

Second, this reauthorization bill makes clear that title III supportive services may include information and counseling regarding private pension rights, and it contains a key new demonstration project aimed at creating models for expanding information and counseling services for older Americans regarding their private pension rights.

These amendments are of great importance. Many older Americans—particularly surviving spouses—have little or no understanding of their private pension rights, and do not have anywhere to turn to get this essential information. I am hopeful that these new provisions of the act will help make a difference—by shedding much-needed light on this complex and difficult subject, and by creating models for the provision of more comprehensive pension-related services in the future.

I would like to make one comment with respect to the new requirements contained in today's bill with respect to public/private partnerships. I agree with the chairman and others who are concerned that we must clearly preserve the public mission of area agencies on aging that choose to enter into public/private partnerships, and I understand the impetus for establishing clearcut rules in this area.

However, I also believe that the evolution of formalized public/private partnerships is a positive development in our efforts to meet the needs of older Americans. Therefore, I am pleased that the report accompanying the bill makes clear that the amendments are not intended to stifle the development of public/private partnerships, but only to ensure that the public mission of triple A's is not in any way compromised.

In my own district, a new public/private partnership is now taking shape that will provide enhanced services for all local residents. I believe that such ventures should be encouraged, and if we find at any stage that they are being impeded by unnecessary regulation, we should take steps to remedy the situation.

Madam Chairman, the Older Americans Act sets forth important goals for our Nation—goals of providing our senior citizens with lives of freedom, opportunity, and dignity. I am convinced that the bill before us today will move our Nation significantly closer to meeting these goals, and I am proud to strongly support it. I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R.

2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991.

I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] for introducing this important measure, and the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for their unceasing efforts on behalf of our Nation's senior citizens.

H.R. 2967 amends the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995. The Older Americans Act of 1965 established a Federal Program to meet the social services needs of older people, particularly low-income individuals and minorities.

This important measure authorizes a total of \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 1992, \$2.2 billion in fiscal year 1993, \$2.4 billion in fiscal year 1994 and \$2.5 billion in fiscal year 1995, for all Older Americans Act administration, research, and services programs for the elderly. Additionally, nearly 70 percent of the funding is for grants to State and area agencies on aging, for support and nutritional services and multipurpose senior citizens centers.

The nutritional services in this measure are provided through several significant programs:

First, \$505 million for congregate meals.

Second, \$120 million for home delivered nutrition services, or Meals on Wheels.

Third, \$15 million for school based meals for older individuals.

This important measure also establishes a new significant program to support caregivers who provide important in-home services to frail elderly. Additionally, H.R. 2967 establishes a National Ombudsman Resource Center, a National Center on Elder Abuse, and a National Commission on Board and Care Facility Quality.

Madam Chairman, senior citizens make up approximately 34.9 million of our population, and this number is growing steadily. The problems that senior citizens are confronting will eventually be faced by the whole population. By supporting H.R. 2967, a clear message is being sent to our Nation's senior citizens that Congress does care.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to give full support to this vital measure.

More specifically, fiscal year 1992 authorizations include funding for: support services, congregate meals, home-delivered meals, the Surplus Commodities Nutrition Program, the Community Service Employment Program, two in-home and frail elderly care programs, and the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program.

To improve the administration of the Older Americans Act, H.R. 2967 places the Administration on Aging [AOA] di-

rectly under the Secretary of Health and Human Services, increases data collection activities, and clarifies criteria for intrastate funding.

□ 1430

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I might consume in order to respond to several Members who have made inquiries and who would have liked to have been on the floor but were not able to be because of other important business.

First of all I would like to respond to the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. DICK ARMEY and Mr. CRAIG WASHINGTON. I had a request from them to clarify whether the Older Americans Act prohibits local coordination of senior services.

I am most pleased to respond to the gentlemen from Texas that it is my understanding there is nothing existing in the law itself or in these amendments that would prohibit States from coordinating program services for senior citizens within their States. In fact, in our amendments we encourage greater coordination of services within the States to provide older Americans services. So I would say to them that there is nothing in the law that prohibits that.

Another Member that I would like to respond to who would have liked to have been here is the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE]. In his inquiry he asked me to clarify the definition of counseling and its interpretation in the Older Americans Act. Mr. ROE has made this request because H.R. 2967 amends the Older Americans Act to enlarge the delivery of counseling services to older Americans.

For the purposes of honoring Mr. ROE's request, I will assist him by submitting him an agreed upon definition of counseling in the conference committee for clarification in the conference language to accompany H.R. 2967. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his advocacy on behalf of our Nation's senior citizens.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself what time I may consume.

Madam Chairman, first of all I would add to what Chairman MARTINEZ has just said. As a matter of fact, in the legislation, we do everything possible to encourage, if not insist, on coordination.

I would add that it is always a joy to come to the floor of the House with a piece of legislation where everybody is getting up and saying how wonderful it is on both sides of the aisle. It must be awfully good because we did not have anyone object thus far. So it is truly a joy to bring legislation that was very, very beneficial to those who need us very much at this time and who have given so much to us in the past.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, in closing, let me say that I, too, echo the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], in that in this bill all sides have participated in a bipartisan manner. We want to especially thank the administration for their advocacy and their willingness to work with us and to compromise on language in the White House Conference on Aging and the different various aspects of the bill.

I must commend the staff, the minority staff, for the excellent work and diligent work they did in fashioning this piece of legislation. We all, I think, agree that what we want is a more efficient act that would provide services in a much more expedient manner to seniors, and, of course, we really want to emphasize that, although we have done all of these things, there is really still a desperate need to increase the money to provide for the services to older Americans.

Madam Chairman, I yield my remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I also yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2967.

The services provided under the Older Americans Act allow many of our senior citizens to live better lives than would be possible otherwise.

I have seen the difference these programs make throughout my district.

Nutrition services—including Meals-On-Wheels—provide good, healthy, and well-balanced meals for people who might not have them otherwise.

Green Thumb provides jobs that would not be there without the program.

Transportation is provided for those who have none—helping access medical and other services critical to older Americans.

I have been honored to participate in the dedication of a number of Green Thumb projects in the First Congressional District of Arkansas—projects which make our communities better.

It is inspirational to see the pride of workmanship displayed by those employed through Green Thumb.

During the last 6 months of 1990, Green Thumb paid more than \$1 million in wages and provided almost 300,000 man-hours of labor in rural Arkansas.

For many it made the difference—allowing them to live life with dignity instead of just barely getting by, or not getting by at all.

Madam Chairman, I am particularly proud of Green Thumb since an Arkansan, Lewis "Red" Johnson, was an

early and consistent supporter of this most worthwhile program.

"Red" Johnson was a person who saw government as a vehicle to help people live better lives. And that is not an antiquated concept.

It's a guide which is as fresh as today's sunrise.

Because of "Red" Johnson, Arkansas was one of the first States in the Nation to offer employment opportunities to older Americans through the Green Thumb Program.

It was December 23, 1965, that 280 positions were authorized for Arkansas, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Oregon.

The program has had but one goal—making life better for those in their twilight years—and it has been successful.

Services offered under the Older Americans Act are vital, and should be expanded.

Madam Chairman, I firmly believe that instead of writing off debt owed to America by foreign countries, we should be collecting those debts and investing that money in expanded services for our own people.

I support this reauthorization, I congratulate those who work to provide these services, and I am grateful they are there to assist older Americans.

Madam Chairman, I wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee for the fine work they have done, and I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Madam Chairman, today, the men and women who built this country into the greatest nation on Earth are attempting to live through the twilight of their years as productive, independent, and healthy citizens.

That is why I rise in strong support of H.R. 2967 which will strengthen and expand the vast array of services to the senior citizens of our country.

As Americans, we take pride in helping one another in times of need. Our society is built on the strong bonds of community and those bonds stretch from the early days of infancy to the proud years of retirement and reflection.

For many older Americans, there is a demonstrated need to provide care and assistance to senior citizens who are trying not to be a burden to their families and society.

These men and women, who fought fascism abroad, who kept our factories running, who built cities and towns, who made our world full of promise and hope for their children, merely want to live their lives without fear of want.

It is our duty as their children and fellow countrymen to support programs that not only assist those who have basic human needs, but those that bind generations together.

H.R. 2967 does that, and as a member of the Aging Committee I am encouraged by the commitment to programs under the act that have a strong record of accomplishment, and new emphasis on problems which have plagued our society for generations—especially elderly abuse.

Elderly abuse has been the silent shame of this country for many years. We all know it ex-

ists. We see its results rather than cure the symptoms and we watch as it denigrates not only the senior citizen, but their families and our society.

I have heard of stories of abuse from senior care providers in my district and State. Their tales are sad, but even more discouraging is the fact that we still know very little about the volume and scope of abuse and neglect of our senior citizens.

While many volunteer care givers, police officers, and family members are doing their best to recognize cases of abuse and neglect, we are still in the dark on how to recognize its symptoms and deal with its causes.

That is why I believe the \$15 million proposed for abuse prevention programs is a good start to tackle this troubling problem.

These funds will not solve the problem of exploitation and abuse. They will not provide a cure for the deep pain and suffering of our seniors who either neglect themselves or who are unable to resist being compromised.

But it will send a message that the children and grandchildren of those who made our country full of promise will not see their parents' hard work fade into the darkness of despair.

The framework of the Older Americans Act is still strong. It will continue to provide hot meals at senior centers, meals on wheels to the homebound, transportation for medical and social needs, and jobs for those who want to supplement their incomes and add to the quality of our work force.

We should all be encouraged by the rich tapestry of services provided under the act and seek to improve the Older Americans Act with more private involvement.

Already, those who benefit from many programs voluntarily contribute to title III programs through donations. There are also thousands of volunteer care givers who spend hours and days making the lives of our seniors more productive and fruitful.

We must continue to seek new private resources to maintain and expand our commitment to senior citizens.

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Chairman. I speak in strong support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act amendments of 1991, which includes a number of improvements and innovations, while preserving the solid foundation of current programs and goals.

This legislation reflects the genius of many of our colleagues and the superb leadership that Chairman Martinez has provided. Mr. MARTINEZ has in his premiere year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources done an outstanding job. I also want to commend the work of Chairman FORD and Mr. KILDEE who has an exceptional record of advocacy for the Older Americans Act [OAA]. H.R. 2967 includes so many excellent provisions that I will only comment on a few during my remarks today.

The OAA is now over 25 years old and it is, by almost any measure, a grand success. It has provided supportive services, congregate and home-delivered meals, community service employment, transportation, and advocacy for millions of older adults. Almost everyone has friends or relatives who have benefited from OAA services which are made available to anyone over the age of 60.

This year's \$1.7 billion reauthorization includes a number of exciting new programs and higher authorization levels for existing programs, but the Older Americans Act is not without problems. Congress has created so many mandates with the OAA that the aging services network constantly struggles to do all we have asked it to do with inadequate funding. Laws like the OAA flourish and grow by adding innovative programs that address current service needs, but each year the appropriations levels are barely enough to provide current service levels. This needs to change and our financial commitment to the OAA must be strengthened if we are to serve our aging population.

Madam Chairman, I would like to speak briefly about a program that I created, the School-Based Meals for Older Individuals and Intergenerational Programs Act, which has been included in this year's reauthorization. I had two primary reasons for developing this legislation. First, we need to provide more congregate and home-delivered meals to older individuals. There are millions of older persons who could benefit from nutritious meals, but the meals are simply not available to them. Second, I believe that intergenerational programs are critical to our future. We must unite the young and the old to enable them to exchange ideas and to assist one another in coping with the demands of our complex world.

This legislation will expand the Meals Program authorized under title III by creating a new congregate meals program for older Americans in elementary and secondary schools, which will be linked to intergenerational programs between students and older adults. This program has been funded at \$15 million, and I believe it will make more meals available to seniors, while at the same time, providing an excellent opportunity for them to improve their self-esteem and make a major contribution to the educational process of our youth. Older Americans will contribute their unique knowledge, talent, and sense of history through roles as tutors, teacher aides, living historians, special speakers, and in other volunteer support roles.

I owe a great deal of gratitude to my distinguished colleague on the Aging Committee, JOLENE UNSOELD, who offered this program as an amendment to H.R. 2967 during full committee markup. I thank her, and Ken Camper, director of the Spice Program in Seattle from which this legislation was modeled.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2967 also increases the per meal reimbursement that service providers receive from the Department of Agriculture from the current 56.76 cents to 65.66 cents per meal. This will help meal providers who have had to cut back programs in the past when reimbursement did not keep up with inflation. Funding levels for the Congregate and Home-delivered Meals Programs have also been increased to \$435 million and \$120 million respectively, and this is also a positive move.

Madam Chairman, although the House bill directs area agencies on aging to work with nonprofit housing entities to better serve residents, and does address several other housing-related issues, I am hopeful that two housing demonstration programs, H.R. 2953 and

H.R. 2954, that I wrote, will be included in the final version of H.R. 2967 when it comes out of conference committee. H.R. 2953, the Housing Ombudsman Act of 1991, would create a \$1 million demonstration to provide advocacy, similar to that provided by the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, for residents of assisted housing projects. H.R. 2954, the Supportive Services in Housing Act of 1991 is a \$4 million demonstration to enable the aging network to better target services to frail, low-income, older individuals, who live in federally assisted housing. We know that premature and unnecessary institutionalization can be prevented with supportive services, and this program would provide the network with an opportunity to show how effectively they could coordinate those services when they are provided with additional resources.

These housing demonstrations have been included in the Senate version of the OAA reauthorization by Senator ADAMS, and I ask the Members of the House to support these important initiatives in conference.

There are many other very positive elements of this year's reauthorization bill, Madam Chairman. It increases title V, the Community Service Employment Program, which is one of the many Older Americans Act programs that enables older individuals to maintain their independence. At a hearing that I conducted in Oak Ridge this year, we received strong testimony that the administration's proposed cutbacks in this program would hurt many Tennesseans. H.R. 2967 increases funding for this critical program from \$448 million to \$470.5 million.

During another hearing that I conducted last year in Chattanooga, I heard firsthand the stories of so many care givers who are at their wit's end trying to care for older, frail relatives. This bill provides funds for a new program for supportive activities for care givers of the elderly. These will include respite for the care givers, counseling, and training. This new program has been funded at \$15 million. I think it is an excellent start toward addressing the needs of the millions of care givers in our Nation, most of whom are women.

H.R. 2967 also improves the long-term Care Ombudsman Program which serves to advocate for the rights of nursing home residents. The bill creates a National Ombudsman Resource Center and an Office of the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman, headed by a Federal Long-Term care ombudsman. This will add a great deal to the ability of this vital program to work in behalf of nursing home and board and care home residents.

Finally, this bill mandates a White House Conference on Aging be held in 1993, and ensures that the Congress will have a role in determining the critical issues that will be addressed. Congratulations must go out to my distinguished colleagues on the Aging Committee, Mr. DOWNEY, for his diligent efforts to push for a conference and involve Congress in its content development.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2967 and applaud the efforts of the distinguished chairmen of the Education and Labor Committee and the Human Resources Subcommittee in crafting a bill that is both fiscally responsible and sen-

sitive to the needs of one of our most vulnerable populations.

I am particularly pleased to note that the bill before us today incorporates a provision from the Freedom from Want Act, legislation I introduced earlier this year, which increases the commodity reimbursement rate for senior meal programs by almost 9 cents per meal. This represents the first adjustment in the rate since 1986.

Today there are more than 30 million Americans 65 years of age or older. One in four has an annual income below \$10,000. They are the single largest demographic group most likely to be at nutritional risk. One in five skips at least one meal each day. Many of these seniors rely heavily on the meals they receive through either the Congregate or Home-Delivered Meals Programs.

For many, this isn't just a good assistance program—the benefit of participation goes beyond the meal itself. The program offers a link to the world outside their front door. Sometimes it is the one factor that keeps them out of nursing homes and in their own homes.

The Select Committee on Hunger, which I have the privilege of chairing, recently conducted an examination of hunger and poverty problems in Appalachian Ohio. While there, we visited the home of Mrs. Mabel Kiraly. Mabel is 75 years old. She lives alone in the same house that she was born in on a \$306-per-month Social Security benefit. She had a fall a few months back and now she needs a walker to get around. Her house sits on the side of a steep hill and, I'll tell you, it's a pretty tricky climb up to the front door. Through the Meals on Wheels Program operated by the local community action agency, Mabel gets a prepared lunch Monday through Friday and two frozen meals to carry her through the weekend. She told us that she depends on this food.

After we left Mabel's house, we were told that, due to inadequate funding, Mabel was one of the many seniors in the area in jeopardy of being cut from the program.

More than 245 million meals were served under the elderly nutrition programs last year, but many meals providers have had to curtail services because of inadequate support. Without additional relief, many more will follow suit. When we start to see a decline in the number of meals served, we are going to have to remember that these numbers represent people. They represent Mabel Kiraly in Glouster, OH, or Ted Jones and Mary Brown in your own congressional district.

The reimbursement increase in H.R. 2967 will keep those meals coming. It will restore services to those whose participation has been terminated. And, for the future, it will assure annual adjustments for inflation so that programs have the resources to keep pace with the true cost of providing each meal.

Madam Chairman, times are hard. But, it is imperative that we continue to adequately support programs and services which have consistently proven to be both efficient and cost effective. The Nutrition Program for the Elderly is such a program. By passing the bill before us today we will help to protect the nutritional well-being of one of our most vulnerable populations.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Older Americans Reau-

thorization Act. This act is now 26 years old, and in this past year alone has provided more than \$1.3 billion in supportive services, nutritious meals, transportation, home care, adult day care, elderly abuse prevention, nursing home quality assurance, and legal services.

As we enter the 21st century, we are faced with a growing population of elderly. We as a civilized nation should assume the responsibility to take care of our senior citizens. The Older Americans Act is the primary vehicle in which we do this.

It is the primary vehicle in which we promote the independence and dignity of our elderly, and acknowledge all they have contributed to our society.

For African-Americans, the problems and hardships accompanied with the aged are more far-reaching and more complex than the total population.

Poverty hits aged African-Americans especially hard and is the primary cause of poor health and the high incidence of disease.

Figures from the 1990 census, show that 44 percent of African-Americans 65 and over live below 125 percent of the poverty line. This statistic is especially shocking when measured against the percentage for the total population of senior citizens which is only 19 percent.

Addressing the needs of the African-American elderly is a unique and challenging problem facing this country's leaders as they attempt to manage an aging society. So often the solution to problems seem far beyond our reach. Yet we believe there is hope for the future.

The Older Americans Act is a solution to the problems we face in providing adequate services to the elderly. This legislation provides better accessibility to health care, nutrition, and community based services.

It is my sincere hope that the day is fast approaching when no elderly person, black or white, will have to live with the threat of exclusion from services that should be offered to all Americans. I urge my colleagues to give their full support to legislation.

Mr. ROE. Madam Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my good friend from Michigan the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Congressman BILL FORD, the ranking minority Congressman GOODLING, and Congressman MARTINEZ, chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources and the ranking minority of the subcommittee Congressman FAWELL, for all their hard work on this critical reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

I would also like to commend Congressman EDWARD ROYBAL, chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, and the ranking minority member on the select committee, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey Congressman MATTHEW RINALDO, who worked diligently with both the select committee staff and the staff of the Subcommittee on Human Resources to bring forth one of the most comprehensive reauthorizations of this legislation. Chairman ROYBAL's numerous hearings with the Select Committee on Aging have served invaluable for information on the status of our Nation's older Americans.

This bill will reauthorize those important programs and services that our Nation's seniors have grown to rely on over the years:

First, the supportive services in senior centers in our district neighborhoods. Which include gerontological counseling services for the purpose of teaching senior citizens about better health care, proper nutrition, educational opportunities, welfare, and recreation.

Second, the congregate and home-delivered meals which reach many of our constituents 5 or more days a week. They provide well balanced and nutritional meals to those who have difficulty preparing their own meals 3 times a day 7 days a week.

Third, the community service employment programs which enable our senior population to continue to contribute to their local communities, and to learn new jobs and tasks. Many times their contributions serve extremely useful to the general welfare of our communities. I know in my own district in New Jersey, the older citizens are always the first to offer their assistance when an extra hand may be needed in the community.

Fourth, and finally, this legislation will reauthorize the training, research and demonstration grants which have been essential in helping Congress directly monitor the condition of our Nation's seniors and the state of programs serving our older Americans. I commend the committee on the development of a much needed Elder Abuse Prevention Program under this section, designed to prevent the abuse, neglect or exploitation of older persons; second the establishment of multigenerational demonstration programs which will allow the elderly the ability to participate in multigenerational activities such as advisers in child care, juvenile delinquency treatment, educational assistance, and family support programs; and notable grants instituted at colleges and universities to prepare students for careers in the field of aging. All of these programs will continue to assist in the delivery of supportive social services to older persons.

The programs of the Older Americans Act authorize these wide array of programs through the network of 57 State agencies on aging and 670 area agencies on aging, and native American grantees. These individuals who have worked as geriatric counselors and within the human development fields have developed an expertise within their profession. It is this profession of gerontological counseling that recently has been recognized as an important element in the carrying out of the programs under this legislation.

In June 1990, under the administration of the National Board of Certified Counselors, an important certification process for gerontological counselors was established. With these new changes occurring within this expanding profession, it became necessary to clarify the terminology of gerontological counseling in the Older Americans Act. I look forward to engaging in a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman, Congressman MARTINEZ later in debate to discuss this specific matter.

I would at this time like to thank the collaboration of the American Association of Counseling and Development and its affiliates nationwide, they have been extremely helpful in educating me on the profession of gerontological counseling and the need for expanding these services in our communities.

Once again, I thank the Members and their staffs for their hard work on this legislation

and the opportunity to work with them to ensure that our Nation's seniors are provided services by individuals certified to perform these essential programs.

Madam Chairman, thank you again for affording me this opportunity to speak on such a vital piece of legislation.

Mr. WEISS. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act amendments. The Older Americans Act, initially conceived and enacted in 1965, paved the way for creation of community-based programs and services intended to improve the quality of life for our older citizens. Over the years, through several reauthorizations, we have continued our commitment to this legislation and the seniors who it impacts.

H.R. 2967 includes \$439.4 million in fiscal year 1992 and "such sums as may be necessary" in fiscal year 1993 through 1995 for the supportive services and senior centers of the Older Americans Act. More specifically, the measure reauthorizes congregate and home-delivered meals, community service employment programs, training, research, demonstration grants, and Indian programs.

The measure creates a new program providing supportive activities for caregivers for frail seniors, as well as a program to provide meals in elementary and secondary schools for older individuals that will be linked to intergenerational programs. It also authorizes demonstration grants for programs to prevent foreclosure and eviction of the elderly and to prepare individuals for careers in the field of aging.

The Nation's seniors desperately need assistance from the Federal Government. State officials around the country are finding it difficult to keep pace with the increasing costs and demands for services. This legislation, coming to us on the 25th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, strives to strengthen our national policy toward successful aging. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. BORSKI. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act amendments. I would like to commend Chairman FORD of the Education and Labor Committee and Chairman MARTINEZ of the Human Resources Subcommittee for their work on this important legislation and their dedication to the needs of the elderly.

The Older Americans Act [OAA] was enacted in 1965 to organize and deliver supportive, nutritional, and other social services for the elderly. While this important law provides vital services to the elderly, it needs to be expanded and strengthened. H.R. 2967 accomplishes this goal by reauthorizing successful supportive programs—such as congregate and home-delivered meals—and creating new, innovative services to support in-home caregivers and nationally monitor long-term care service delivery.

H.R. 2967 also authorizes \$470.5 million for the Senior Community Service Employment Program [SCSEP], which creates jobs for thousands of low-income senior citizens nationwide. Earlier this year, the Bush administration's budget proposal for fiscal year 1992 requested a \$47.5 million cut for SCSEP, which, if enacted, would have resulted in a loss of 7,800 job slots. I am encouraged to see that H.R. 2967 calls for full funding for this cost-effective employment program.

In addition, H.R. 2967 changes current law to require—instead of allow—the President to convene a national conference on aging in 1993. As you know, White House Conferences on Aging, which have contributed significantly to Federal policy on aging, have been held in 1950, 1961, 1971, and 1981. Contrary to the intent of OAA, the President did not convene a conference in 1991. H.R. 2967 will ensure that this important forum is held to focus national attention on the issues that affect all senior citizens.

Madam Chairman, as a member of the Select Committee on Aging, I recognize the value of OAA programs to our Nation's elderly. I urge my colleagues to contribute to the further success of these programs by supporting the passage of this well-crafted legislation.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. At the outset I want to congratulate Mr. MARTINEZ, the chairman of the subcommittee, and Mr. FAWELL, the ranking minority member, for bringing to the floor a bill with bipartisan support.

I am particularly pleased to vote to reauthorize this act which was first enacted in 1965 under the leadership of two great Americans, Senator Pat McNamara and Congressman James G. O'Hara, both of Michigan.

The Older Americans Act [OAA] provides critical support to our Nation's senior citizens so that they may continue to lead productive, independent, and fulfilled lives. Funds appropriated to OAA programs pay for 250 million congregate and home delivered meals. Every American has heard of Meals on Wheels but most don't know that it is the cornerstone of the OAA. In addition, the OAA supports some 65,000 community service jobs for low-income persons who are 55 years old and above. The OAA also authorizes a wide range of supportive services including in home and long-term care, multipurpose senior centers, legal services, as well as advocacy to ensure that the rights of our senior citizens are not abridged and that they are not taken advantage of.

The number of people above the age of 60, and the relative proportion of this group to general population, is increasing dramatically. The number of seniors who are 85 and above, and most likely to need assistance, is growing most rapidly of all. A real strength of the Older Americans Act is that it changes to reflect and address the changing needs of seniors as they live longer and make new accommodations to meet new circumstances.

The bill makes several more such changes.

The role of the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging [AOA] is strengthened and upgraded to reflect the important role of seniors in our daily lives;

Creation of a National Center on Elder Abuse to provide research, training, and information about elder abuse to heighten awareness of the problem and to assist policymakers at the Federal and State levels.

Establishment of the Office of the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman to, among other duties, investigate any situation that may adversely affect the health, safety, welfare, or rights of older individuals.

Enhanced data collection to provide for meaningful evaluation of service delivery and

to determine whether those who receive services are the most in need.

In addition, the authorization assumed in the OAA reauthorization is significantly higher than the current level. I am glad that the committee saw fit to reject the administration's budget proposal for an overall freeze in OAA funding and a 10-percent cut in the Senior Employment Program.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Madam Chairman, I join my colleagues today in rising in support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. I would first like to commend the members of the Education and Labor Committee and my colleagues on the Select Committee on Aging for the time and energy they devoted to obtaining input from seniors, aging groups, service providers, and administrators as they worked to form this comprehensive reauthorizing legislation.

Since its enactment in 1965, the Older Americans Act has grown to be the primary program responsible for providing a wide array of services to persons 60 years of age and older. These services include congregate and home delivered meals, social and legal services, job training and placement, as well as ombudsman services. H.R. 2967 will reauthorize the Older Americans Act for 4 years, to include a total of \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 1992, \$2.2 billion in fiscal year 1993, \$2.4 billion in fiscal year 1994, and \$2.5 billion in fiscal year 1995 for research, services, and administrative programs for senior citizens.

H.R. 2967 also makes some changes in existing programs to improve the administration of the act. Section 112 of the bill contains provisions for enhanced data collection, and I consider this section to be an important improvement which would aid the Administration on Aging in monitoring and targeting the delivery of services to those seniors most in need. Under this new provision, the Commissioner on Aging, after consulting with State, area, and local organizations and providers, would assist in designing and implementing uniform data collection procedures for use by State agencies. These new procedures would include uniform definitions and nomenclature, standardized data collection procedures, and, of particular importance, establish procedures for the assessment of unmet needs for services under the act.

While our elderly population continues to grow at everincreasing rates, budgetary constraints have become increasingly tighter. Because the resources to meet the needs of this rapidly growing population are difficult to find, it is imperative that limited funds reach the most needy individuals. The new data collection standards outlined in H.R. 2967 will assist States in compiling the necessary statistics and meeting the mandate of the Older Americans Act to target those seniors in greatest economic and social need.

Once again, I would encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2967, a bill that is vital in reauthorizing programs to provide substantial services to all senior citizens, while targeting those older Americans who have special needs. The Older Americans Act has grown to be a monumental vehicle for maintaining an effective aging network. It is my hope that through the reauthorization process this year and the consideration of H.R. 2967,

we have highlighted its many accomplishments, as well as ensured its success for years to come.

Mr. RINALDO. Madam Chairman, the Older Americans Act reauthorization is the most important seniors' legislation Congress will consider this year. I commend the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee, for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

For 25 years, the Older Americans Act has met the needs of millions of seniors by providing meals, transportation, employment, and advice about nursing homes and the benefits they are entitled to receive. It differs from most of the other aid programs administered by the Federal Government because rather than simply handing out help, the Older Americans Act is a helping hand for seniors.

The reauthorization process enables Congress to reexamine the act periodically, continuing programs which work and designing programs to meet new challenges facing our Nation's elderly. I believe that the committee's bill enhances and improves the present act.

In addition, I am pleased Chairman MARTINEZ has included in the committee en bloc amendment my proposal to strengthen current law by permitting States to fund entitlement outreach programs in areas with the greatest social and economic need. This language will help to make needy seniors aware of benefits under Medicaid, the Supplemental Security Income Program, and the Food Stamp Program for which they may be eligible.

A report issued earlier this year by the Families USA organization found that substantial numbers of seniors were unaware of their eligibility of Federal assistance. My recommendation addresses the needs of millions of older Americans who are not taking advantage of their full benefits. More needs to be done to inform seniors of their benefits, and I urge my colleagues to approve these changes and step up the efforts to reach out to our most needy seniors.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act. This legislation targets critically needed services to those low-income elderly individuals who are most in need in my district and across the United States.

We all get older, that's just a fact of life. However, just because we get older doesn't mean that we can't remain active. For example, senior centers, which are eligible to receive funding from this legislation, can use funds to coordinate group activities, outings, and events for still active elderly individuals. Additionally, this bill provides programmatic funding so that elderly people can work and interact with young people to share the experience and expertise gained from a lifetime of living.

This legislation also provides services such as transportation, Meals on Wheels, in-home services, services for frail elderly, employment and information, and other supportive services to millions of low-income elderly individuals. Without these services, many of the elderly in New Mexico, particularly Hispanic, native American, and rural elderly, would be unable

to get to their doctor's appointments, do their shopping, or take care of necessary day-to-day activities.

Additionally, many of the programs in this legislation provide much needed in-home assistance to thousands of elderly individuals thereby allowing them to remain in their own homes rather than consigning them to the sterile environment of a nursing home. This bill also provides important protection for elderly individuals against elderly abuse or neglect which, unfortunately, has become increasingly widespread.

Since New Mexico is a rural State with a high percentage of Indian and Hispanic residents, I am hopeful that both of these populations will benefit from the increased outreach programs and other critically needed services this legislation provides.

Madam Chairman, as a member of the Select Committee on Aging, I have worked hard during my tenure in Congress to improve the overall well-being of our Nation's elderly population. I believe the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act addresses many of their concerns. I am proud to lend my support to this important legislation and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Chairwoman, I am pleased to rise in support of the legislation that is before us today, H.R. 2967, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act. Since its enactment in 1965, the Older Americans Act has provided essential services and programs to this Nation's senior citizens. This legislation will strengthen the act and will enable us to expand the services available to seniors and their caregivers.

Without question, nutrition programs provided under title III of the act are essential to the well-being of older Americans. The congregate and home-delivered meals programs ensure that older Americans are receiving, at a minimum, one nutritional meal each day. This program, which is primarily carried out by area agencies on aging, also provides seniors with much needed social interaction and activity. I am pleased that the Education and Labor Committee recognized the importance of these nutrition programs in the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

My colleagues should also support the bill because of several other important Older American Act programs it reauthorizes. The bill provides \$29 million for frail elderly in-home services and \$15 million to provide support for in-home caregivers. I have long been an advocate of in-home and respite care services. As the American population continues to grow older, the need for these services will also continue to grow.

Passage of this legislation will assist this Nation's senior citizens in their every day lives through the supportive services, nutrition, legal aid, employment, and long-term care programs under the Older Americans Act.

The Older Americans Act has been a success and I strongly urge my colleagues to support its reauthorization.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairwoman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991.

Since its inception in 1965, the Older Americans Act has proven to be one of the most

successful programs enacted by the Federal Government.

With the aging of the population, and more and more elderly individuals confronted with the issue of paying increasing amounts for health care and housing, the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act are more critical now than ever.

Madam Chairwoman, I am particularly pleased that H.R. 2967 includes a new provision I introduced to authorize supportive activities for persons who provide in-home services to frail older individuals.

Due to a number of factors, including the aging of the population and the increases in life expectancy, more and more families are caring for an elderly relative in their homes.

According to the Pepper Commission report on comprehensive health care:

Almost three-quarters of severely disabled elders receiving long-term care at home or in the community in 1989 relied solely on family members or other unpaid help.

Persons caring for frail elderly individuals are typically women, wives, or daughters, who struggle to provide consistent care and to manage their own lives as well.

It is not uncommon to find an elderly woman who not only cares for a frail husband but a disabled child as well.

These individuals desperately need a variety of supportive services including someone to come into the home for brief intervals to allow them to conduct personal business, keep doctors appointments, or go grocery shopping without having to worry about the safety of their loved one.

Other critical services available to caregivers under title III-H include counseling and support, training, and linkages with other services.

H.R. 2967 also contains amendments I introduced to increase opportunities for elderly minority individuals to participate in title III programs authorized under the Older Americans Act.

Over the past several years, organizations representing elderly individuals have continued to express concern that minority persons were not being adequately served by the act.

One way of addressing this issue is to require more accountability in the system.

H.R. 2967 establishes new procedures for ensuring that services are further targeted to those most in need by requiring the Commissioner on Aging to approve or disapprove State funding formulas.

Additionally, area agencies must provide designs for how they plan to increase minority participation in their service areas and include them in the plans they are required to submit to State offices.

This new authority will ensure that funds provided to States for Older Americans Act services will be distributed in an equitable manner, with particular attention to those who are most vulnerable.

Madam Chairwoman, I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. These amendments will not only strengthen and improve the provision of services to America's elderly, but will make the Older Americans

Act, one of our best examples of a public/private partnership, even better. With more than 31 million Americans over the age of 60, the Older Americans Act will continue to play an essential and increasing role in the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

I wish to commend Mr. MARTINEZ and his subcommittee staff, and Education and Labor staff for their hard work on this legislation. I also wish to thank them for their willingness to work with me and with Mr. DOWNEY to include our amendment on quality assurances for in-home services to the frail elderly.

Meals on Wheels, home repair services, homemaker and home-health aid services, legal services to the elderly, elder abuse services, and transportation services are but a few of the services that are provided under the Older Americans Act. These vital services have enabled thousands of America's senior citizens to live independently in their homes and in their communities eliminating unnecessary institutionalization.

The 1987 Older Americans Act amendments authorized in title III the provision of in-home services for frail older individuals to prevent their premature institutionalization. These services include homemaker and home health aides, visiting and telephone reassurance, chore maintenance, in-home respite care for families and adult day care as a respite service for families.

Quality of care is a critical issue in home care and is a concern of both providers and individuals receiving in-home services. All too often we have read about elderly individuals who have been targets of fraudulent home repair services, or individuals who have had family mementos or personal property stolen by persons sent into their homes to help them.

Through passage of the 1987 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act—OBRA—87, Public Law 100—203—Congress made significant progress in protecting home care consumers by strengthening Medicare conditions of participation, particularly regarding training and testing of homemaker health aides. Those new standards and protections apply only to Medicare and Medicaid certified agencies, and not to organizations that do not receive funds from such sources.

But there are no Federal standards or provisions comparable to the 1987 OBRA provisions to assure quality of care provided under the Older Americans Act. Neither the enabling laws nor the implementing regulations place any supervision, training, or testing requirements on individuals who perform personal care activities. Effective State regulation of paraprofessional services exist in less than half of the States.

This lack of Federal and State quality assurance standards means that individuals providing the in-home services often go without appropriate training and supervision. And when underqualified individuals are put in the position of providing personal care, there is an increased risk that the quality of care will be poor. The risk of fraud and abuse against elderly and disabled clients may also increase.

The quality assurance amendment which Mr. DOWNEY and I have offered will ensure that individuals receiving in-home home health aide services under the Older Americans Act receive the same type of consumer protec-

tions that are provided under Medicare or Medicaid. Our amendment cross-walks where applicable, the 1987 OBRA Medicare and Medicaid quality assurance requirements for the provision of in-home services into the Older Americans Act.

Our amendment has two sections. The first section requires that home health aide services provided under section 341(a) of the Older Americans Act be provided by individuals employed by an entity that is either, first, a home health agency that meets the Medicare requirements of the Social Security Act; or second, is licensed under State law that requires training, testing, and supervisions substantially equivalent to the training, testing, and supervision required by Medicare, or third, is accredited by an agency approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The second section of our amendment requires that the entities that provide home health aide services promote the rights of each older individual who receives such services. These rights are identical to the 1987 OBRA legislation and include the right, first, to be fully informed in advance about the in-home services to be provided, and any change in the services; second, to participate in planning and changing these services unless the individual is judicially adjudged incompetent; third, to voice grievance with respect to such service, without discrimination or reprisal, fourth, to confidentiality of records; fifth, to have the property of the individual receiving the service treated with respect; and sixth, to be fully informed, orally and in writing, in advance of receiving in-home services, of their rights and obligations under this act.

The Older Americans Act has served as an important program in helping older individuals to maintain their independence and to avoid unnecessary and premature institutionalization. The addition of Federal quality assurance standards will strengthen both the act and the provisions of in-home services to help meet its goals.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Chairman, the legislation we consider today, H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991, is of critical importance to millions of our elderly relatives, friends, and neighbors. When we speak of the Older Americans Act, we are really talking about countless locally organized service programs that make the lives of older people much better than they might otherwise be. We are speaking of Meals on Wheels programs, of neighborhood senior centers, of legal services, of home repair and chore assistance, of in-home health care services, of rides to the mall, and of elder abuse prevention programs. There are so many programs housed under the broad roof of the Older Americans Act, that it is difficult to list them all. But one thing is certain: All of these programs enjoy a remarkable track record of providing service over the past 26 years.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Services of the Select Committee on Aging, I have been privileged over the past 3 years to meet many of the people who administer these programs at all levels, from the U.S. Commissioner on Aging to volunteers who serve the meals and deliver the reassuring words of comfort that personify the act. I have also had the pleasure of working with my

colleagues, Congresswomen SNOWE, the ranking minority member, the members of the Subcommittee on Human Services, Chairman ROYBAL, Chairman MARTINEZ, and Chairman FORD. Many people have joined their efforts to draft this reauthorization bill and I appreciate the consideration shown to me.

During the past 3 years, the Subcommittee on Human Services has held a series of hearings focusing on the Older Americans Act as preparation for this reauthorization process. We began with the Commissioner on Aging, Dr. Joyce Berry, and fittingly we ended with the Assistant Secretary of HHS responsible for carrying out the reorganization of the Department and upgrading the status of the Administration on Aging. In between, the subcommittee heard testimony regarding the special needs of the frail elderly, the opportunities and problems posed by public-private partnerships, transportation needs, research programs and data collection problems, and health promotion and outreach programs. I hope that the subcommittee's work has been helpful in developing these amendments before us.

There are a number of provisions of these amendments that merit particular attention. First, I am pleased to note that the amendments adopt a significant feature of legislation I introduced earlier this year to establish a National Conference on Aging. As my colleagues know, we should have had a White House Conference on Aging this year, but we are not going to because of the administration's failure to pay proper attention to the issue. As a result, the conference has been postponed until 1993. However, the amendments before us today give Congress a role in setting the policy and determining the agenda for the conference, through the establishment of a conference policy committee. By giving Congress a role in the White House Conference on Aging, we hope to be able to avoid a situation where, either through neglect or oversight, future conferences are put off. Furthermore since Congress will have to pass any legislative recommendations which may arise out of the conference, it makes sense to have Congress involved in the conference itself. I commend Chairmen FORD and MARTINEZ for their efforts to bring this significant reform about and I appreciate their willingness to consider and adopt my proposal.

For the past decade, Congress has struggled with the problem of elder abuse. The late chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, Congressman Claude Pepper, brought this problem into public view and it is fitting that the Older Americans Act has become the focus of legislative efforts on elder abuse. This bill makes significant improvements in the elder abuse provisions of the act and I am encouraged that all of those who have worked so hard over the years could agree on a common approach. I am particularly happy that the act continues to allow the States broad latitude in designing their own education, reporting, and treatment programs.

I am also pleased that a proposal to assure quality of care for in-home health care services provided under title III G of the act has been included. This proposal, developed by Congressman MILLER and me, arose in part out of my concern that where services are comparable, older Americans should enjoy the

same protection and assurances of quality care that exist under Medicare or other Federal programs. In the years ahead, as we address the issue of long-term care in a more comprehensive manner, it is important that we do not lose sight of the need to ensure that individuals who provide these services are qualified and properly supervised.

Today, we are also addressing the issue of personnel training and development for Older Americans Act programs. For many years, the act has required the Commissioner to develop, in coordination with other Federal agencies, a national plan for personnel training and development. Yet this plan has never seen the light of day. It is important that this mandate be implemented and the legislation before us requires the Commissioner to report to Congress on progress in implementing the mandate of section 202(a)(17), and I am grateful to the committee for implementing my proposal in this area.

In addition, these amendments include a provision which requires the Commissioner on Aging to publish an annual report of completed research funded under the title IV program. This provision arises directly from a hearing held by our subcommittee on research programs under the act. In its testimony, the General Accounting Office reported that the Administration on Aging lacked a comprehensive dissemination effort despite the fact that title IV grantees often produced findings which were useful to the aging network. State agencies reported that access to this information was haphazard. I believe that this simple step will increase the efficacy of the title IV program.

Finally, it is worth noting something which is not in today's legislation—mandatory cost sharing for services provided under the act. The administration recommended that a fee-for-service system be adopted, a proposal which radically challenges the very nature of the act. The subcommittee was deeply interested in this issue and carried out and published "Cost Sharing for the Elderly: A Survey of Current Incidence and Practice," which details the diversity of views on this issue. I am happy to say that Congress has rejected this proposal.

Madam Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not publicly thank the staff of the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office for the assistance provided to the Subcommittee on Human Services. I think we have all benefited from the many reports they have provided us.

I urge my colleagues to support this fine bill. Millions of elderly people are counting on the services we authorize today. They have worked hard to make this a strong Nation and they deserve our support.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Madam Chairman, as this Nation faces the graying of our population, we must face up to the challenge of providing adequate support services for the elderly such as comprehensive long-term health care. Many of the elderly have a disabling condition. Many are alone. We will all need help some day.

One of the most successful Federal programs has been the Older Americans Act. It has been successful because it fills a real need. It provides those supportive services to

the elderly like Meals on Wheels and home health care that give our seniors the support they need to enable them to live a full life with dignity and to stay in their homes.

The programs funded by the Older Americans Act are crucial for thousands of America's elderly who depend on them for food, transportation, employment and training. H.R. 2967 also authorizes a number of new programs to provide more extended care for our neediest senior citizens.

Since it was first enacted in 1965, the Older Americans Act has provided a wide array of programs to seniors in their homes and in their communities, programs such as congregate—designated sites—and home-delivered meals, home health care, transportation, homemaker assistance, chore maintenance, legal services, and employment. A key benefit of these services is that they enable elderly persons to live independently on their own, where they want to be. It helps prevent them from being forced into institutions.

Close to 70 percent of the funds under the Older Americans Act support a nationwide network of state agencies on aging to provide a wide range of services such as Meals on Wheels, transportation and assistance for senior centers. In Nebraska, senior citizens make up nearly 20 percent of our State population. We are experiencing a continuing rise in our aging population. From 1980 to 1990, Nebraska's 85-and-older population rose by 25 percent. This growth rate was higher than any other State, a striking testament to our healthy Midwestern lifestyle and environment.

Nebraska received more than \$5 million in funds in 1990 from the Older Americans Act to provide 226,871 rides to 7,433 older individuals; 14,379 hours of legal services to 7,443 senior citizens; 150,080 telephone reassurance calls to 10,717 elderly citizens who are home-bound, to see if they were all right or needed assistance; and 50,860 hours of education and training to 6,127 of our seniors. These funds allowed community service centers, organizations, and support groups to provide care and services to 25 percent of Nebraska's 60-and-older population.

H.R. 2967 authorizes \$15 million to create a new program providing supportive activities for in-home caregivers for the frail elderly. Over 80 percent of all care for the frail elderly is provided by family members. Because of our aging population, there is a great need for in-home and community-based services, including respite for caregivers, to help those who are providing the bulk of personal care for the elderly. The intent of these programs is to keep people as independent and in their home as long as possible, thus enhancing their quality of life.

The Older Americans Act of 1991 also requires the President to convene a National Conference on Aging in 1993. A White House Conference on Aging has convened once each decade since 1960. These conferences have provided critical insights and recommendations in the field of aging. The impact of our growing population of elderly makes it more critical that planning be done now for needs of the future elderly as well as the unmet needs of our elderly today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting reauthorization of the Older Americans

Act. It has created proven programs that many of our seniors have come to depend on for their dignity and independence. It is an excellent program.

Mrs. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. The OAA has been an unusually successful piece of legislation. The act has come during an era when medical and health miracles have extended the lives of millions of Americans. Along with these miracles, however, comes the responsibility to help older Americans live lives that continue to be meaningful and purposeful.

Here in the Nation's Capital, more than 18 percent of the total population is over 60 years of age—up 4 percent since 1980. In 1985, 17 percent of the District's elderly population was living below poverty level. We cannot afford to let the wealth of experience and knowledge these citizens possess be wasted. We must provide for them in their golden years.

The District of Columbia Office on Aging, the local agency created to administer the Federal funds from the act, served over 30,000 seniors in fiscal year 1990. Through that office, 42 community-based agencies provide essential social and supportive services such as home-delivered meals, case assessment and management, inhome supportive services, minor home repair and renovation, and legal advice.

These programs help to fully incorporate seniors in the life of this city and this country. No country that calls itself compassionate can help but embrace this legislation. Please support it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Madam Chairman, I am proud to support the legislation reauthorizing the Older Americans Act which the House considers today.

Twenty-six years ago when the Older Americans Act became law, Congress made a promise to senior citizens that the Federal Government would help them overcome individual and social barriers to health maintenance, economic independence, and personal dignity. As the House moves today to reauthorize the act, we recognize the great achievement of this legislation.

The programs provided under the Older Americans Act meet some of the senior citizens' most basic needs—for nutrition, transportation, even companionship. Certainly, this is not too much to give to older Americans who have enriched our Nation's history, lend meaning to the present day, and give promise to our future. Today's senior citizens have defended the Nation's freedom and kept alive for posterity traditional American values. Who could deny this deserving population?

The 30th Congressional District of New York, which I am proud to represent, is home to some 58,000 senior citizens and the greater Rochester area has a proud history of meeting their needs and looking out for their interests. Rochester-area service organizations have created dozens of innovative programs for the elderly and seniors here have many opportunities—exercise classes, mental health programs, nutritional counseling, respite for caregivers and ombudsman services. The Older Americans Act has been instrumental in shaping this proud tradition of service, com-

plementing the work of seniors and providers in upstate New York with a solid Federal commitment to the needs of our aging population.

While Rochester-area service providers do a remarkable job of making these programs available, funding constraints exist so that not all senior residents have access to services. In hearings of the Select Committee on Aging held in Washington and in my own congressional district, I have consistently advocated for full funding of the Older Americans Act. I am gratified that H.R. 2967, the 1991 reauthorization of the act, includes a \$600 million increase in authorized funding over the fiscal year 1991 appropriation.

I am also gratified that the Education and Labor Committee has seen fit to reject the administration's proposal to repeal certain unfunded programs authorized by the Older Americans Act. Among these yet unfunded programs are the health promotion and education services added to title III of the act by an amendment I authored during the 1987 reauthorization.

My amendment authorized the establishment in senior centers of health insurance needs counseling programs to protect seniors with limited incomes from Medigap insurance fraud and to help them understand their Medicare and private health insurance coverage. Also authorized by my 1987 amendment to the Older Americans Act were mental health screening, preventive health programs, exercise classes, nutrition counseling and other important programs which ensure not only the health, but also the quality of life, of our Nation's senior citizens.

The problems our senior citizens face today will only be exacerbated in the coming decades. The growing numbers of elderly, rising health care and prescription drug costs, and increasing long term care needs are already challenging the existing service delivery infrastructure. As senior citizens seek to protect themselves from these trends, they often go too far and end up with shoe boxes full of costly, duplicative and worthless health insurance policies. They can be confused by the denial of claims and unsure of what Medicare covers. They worry about losing their homes or being unable to care for a beloved spouse. They dread living alone.

These are just the types of problems which the Older Americans Act can help solve. And, these are just the types of problems which command comprehensive study and long-range policy considerations; which is why the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991 will require the President to convene a National Conference on Aging in 1993. Such a conference will identify problems of older individuals, develop recommendations for the coordination of Federal policy and local needs, and develop a comprehensive, long-range legislative strategy for maintaining and improving the quality of life for older Americans.

My colleagues will recall that the authorization we passed in 1987 gave the President authority to convene a 1991 White House Conference on Aging. I wrote to the President and, on behalf of my constituents, strongly urged him to convene a broad-based and adequately funded 1991 Conference on Aging. Despite my petitions and the urging of the Select Committee on Aging Subcommittee on

Human Services, seniors advocacy organizations, and my own long-term care advisory committee, the President failed to convene such a vital conference. I am gratified that the legislation we consider today makes certain a 1993 conference will occur and the issues of critical importance to senior citizens will be given due consideration.

As the elderly population continues to grow, the Older Americans Act is a promise we can't afford to break. Millions of senior citizens have come to depend on the Older Americans Act. On their behalf, I cast my "yes" vote on H.R. 2967 today and I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 2967, that would reauthorize one of the most important pieces of legislation to come from Congress, the Older Americans Act.

The Older Americans Act, created in 1965, is the only Federal act dedicated to providing vital social services for those Americans in their golden years, our senior citizens. It does indeed symbolize a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to ensuring that this important population receive essential nutrition and support services with as little cost to them as possible.

H.R. 2967 requires a State's distribution formula be based on the best available data on low-income older individuals, low-income minority older individuals, and frail older individuals that reside in the State. The Commissioner shall develop regulations to insure that statistically relevant and verifiable data shall be used by States to assess the needs for services of these groups.

Within this population are resources as varied and rich as in any other segment of our society. It behooves us as a Nation to aide and encourage each senior citizen to live as full a life as possible.

Intergenerational programs that foster interaction between seniors and children should be encouraged. H.R. 2967 creates programs that would provide meals for the elderly in elementary and secondary schools to do just this.

Let's continue a proper allegiance to the elderly people of this Nation who have already paid their dues, and paved the way for each of us, by giving back to them. I urge the full support of my colleagues for H.R. 2967.

Mr. HERTEL. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Older Americans Act of 1991. Seniors have given a lifetime of hard work to this country, and in the retirement years deserve the best we have to offer. We owe it to Seniors to make their lives comfortable and worry-free. The passage of this bill helps promote this end. I am particularly pleased that Native Americans are not forgotten under this measure as it authorizes money for Native American aging programs.

Madam Chairman, the history of success of programs sponsored under the Older Americans Act are stellar. Each day, millions of seniors from all parts of the country share a meal and companionship through the congregate meal program. Thousands more elderly are able to live in their own homes rather than in institutions as a direct result of the Meals on Wheels Program. Many of these programs are beneficial simply because they encourage seniors to get out into, or remain a part of the

community which deters loneliness, one of the most common complaints of our elderly population. Other programs, such as employment and legal services, as well as disease prevention programs have remarkably proven their effectiveness.

Madam Chairman, it is particularly important to note that H.R. 2967 states that the President shall convene a National Conference on Aging in 1993. In past years, the Older Americans Act allowed, but did not require the President to call such a conference. The last conference was held in 1981, and traditionally, there has been a conference every 10 years. It is high time for the administration to address the aging issues which it has been avoiding. It is unfortunate that a conference was not called for this year, as it allows for debate on issues that have such a great impact on our senior population.

Madam Chairman, the continual erosion of programs that are beneficial to our seniors over the last 10 years is an outrage. The benign neglect by the administration of senior citizens is unwarranted and unconscionable. The Older Americans Act of 1991 is a bill that will positively affect the quality of life for those Americans who have earned the right to enjoy a decent retirement.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the House Report 102-200 shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purposes of amendment and each title is considered as read.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the Nature of a Substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Section 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Subtitle A—Declaration of Objectives; Definitions

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Subtitle B—Administration on Aging

Sec. 111. Establishment of Administration on Aging.

Sec. 112. Functions of Commissioner.

Sec. 113. Federal agency consultation.

Sec. 114. Federal Council on Aging.

Sec. 115. Administration of Act.

Sec. 116. Evaluation.

Sec. 117. Reports.

Sec. 118. Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman.

Sec. 119. Authorization of appropriations for salaries and expenses.

Sec. 120. Authorization of appropriations for the National Commission on Board and Care Facility Quality.

Subtitle C—Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging

Sec. 131. Definitions.

Sec. 132. Authorization of appropriations; uses of funds.

Sec. 133. Allotment; Federal share.

Sec. 134. Organization.

Sec. 135. Area plans.

Sec. 136. State plans.

Sec. 137. Planning, coordination, evaluation, and administration of State plans.

Sec. 138. Disaster relief reimbursements.

Sec. 139. Availability of surplus commodities.

Sec. 140. Supportive services and senior centers.

Sec. 141. School-based meals for older individuals and multigenerational programs.

Sec. 142. Preventive health services.

Sec. 143. Prevention of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals.

Sec. 144. Supportive activities for caregivers who provide in-home services to frail older individuals.

Subtitle D—Training, Research, and Discretionary Projects and Programs

Sec. 161. Statement of purpose.

Sec. 162. Administration.

Sec. 163. Grants and contracts.

Sec. 164. Multidisciplinary centers of gerontology.

Sec. 165. Career preparation for the field of aging.

Sec. 166. Pension information and counseling demonstration projects.

Sec. 167. Foreclosure and eviction assistance and relief services demonstration projects.

Sec. 168. Demonstration projects.

Sec. 169. Special projects in comprehensive long-term care.

Sec. 170. Demonstration projects for multigenerational activities.

Sec. 171. Private resource enhancement projects.

Sec. 172. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 173. Responsibilities of commissioner.

Subtitle E—Community Service Employment for Older Americans

Sec. 181. Older American community service employment program.

Sec. 182. Administration.

Sec. 183. Interagency cooperation.

Sec. 184. Equitable distribution of assistance.

Sec. 185. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 186. Dual eligibility.

Sec. 187. Treatment of assistance provided under the Older American Community Service Employment Act of 1965.

Subtitle F—Grants for Native Americans

Sec. 191. Grants authorized.

Sec. 192. Applications by tribal organizations.

Sec. 193. Applications by organizations serving native Hawaiians.

Sec. 194. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle G—Technical Corrections

Sec. 198. Technical amendments.

TITLE II—1993 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGING

Sec. 201. 1993 National Conference on Aging.

Sec. 202. Conference required.

Sec. 203. Conference administration.

Sec. 204. Policy committee; related committees.

Sec. 205. Report of the conference.

Sec. 206. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle III—Amendments to the Native American Programs Act of 1974

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Establishment of administration for native Americans.

Sec. 303. Loan fund; demonstration project.

Sec. 304. Technical assistance and training.

Sec. 305. Evaluation.

Sec. 306. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Limitation on authority to enter into contracts.

Sec. 402. Effective dates; application of amendments.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Subtitle A—Declaration of Objectives; Definitions

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

(a) RELOCATING DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(13) The term 'abuse' means the willful—
"(A) infliction of injury, unreasonable confinement, intimidation, or cruel punishment with resulting physical harm or pain, or mental anguish; or
"(B) deprivation by a caretaker of goods or services which are necessary to avoid physical harm, mental anguish, or mental illness.

"(14) The term 'adult child with a disability' means a child who—
"(A) is 18 years of age or older;
"(B) is financially dependent on such child's parent who is an older individual; and
"(C) has a disability.

"(15) The term 'area agency on aging' means an area agency on aging designated under section 305(a)(2).
"(16) The term 'board and care facility' means a facility regulated by a State pursuant to section 1616(e) of the Social Security Act.

"(17) The term 'caretaker' means an individual who has the responsibility for the care of an older individual, either voluntarily, by contract, receipt of payment for care, as a result of family relationship or by order of a court of competent jurisdiction.
"(18) The term 'elder abuse' means abuse of an older individual.

"(19) The term 'focal point' means a facility established to encourage the maximum collocation and coordination of services for older individuals.
"(20) The term 'frail' means having a physical or mental disability, including having Alzheimer's disease or a related disorder with neurological or organic brain dysfunction, that restricts the ability of an individual to perform normal daily tasks or which threatens the capacity of an individual to live independently.

"(21) The term 'greatest economic need' means the need resulting from an income level at or below the poverty levels established by the Bureau of the Census.

"(22) The term 'greatest social need' means the need caused by noneconomic factors, including—

"(A) physical and mental disabilities;
"(B) language barriers; and
"(C) cultural, social, or geographical isolation, including isolation caused by racial or ethnic status.

"(23) The term 'older individual' means an individual who is 60 years of age or older.

"(24) The term 'physical harm' means bodily pain, injury, impairment, or disease."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 302 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (9), (11), (14), (15), (16), (19), (20), and (21), and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (10), (17), and (18) as paragraphs (9), (10), and (11), respectively.

(2) Section 307(a)(10) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027) is amended by striking "section 342(1)" and inserting "section 342".

(3) Section 342 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030i) is amended—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"DEFINITION OF IN-HOME SERVICES",

(B) by striking paragraph (2),

(C) in paragraph (1)

(i) in subparagraph (E) by striking "; and" and inserting a period, and

(ii) by indenting 2 ems the left margin of subparagraphs (A) through (E) and redesignating such subparagraphs as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively, and

(D) by striking "part—" and all that follows through "includes—", and inserting "part, the term 'in-home services' includes—".

Subtitle B—Administration on Aging

SEC. 111. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION ON AGING.

Section 201 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following:

"The Administration shall be under the direct authority and supervision of the Secretary, and the Commissioner shall report directly to the Secretary on all matters relating to this Act, including policy, budget, and administration of programs.", and

(B) in the last sentence by inserting "(including the functions of the Commissioner carried out through regional offices)" after "Commissioner" the first place it appears,

(2) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (G) by striking "and" at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (H) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon, and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) promote coordination between the administration of title III and the administration of title VI, including sharing among grantees information on programs funded, and on training and technical assistance provided, under such titles; and

"(J) serve as the effective and visible advocate on behalf of older Indians, older Alaskan Natives, and older Native Hawaiians, in the States to promote the enhanced delivery of services and implementation of programs, under this Act and other Federal Acts, for the benefit of older Indians, older Alaskan Natives, and older Native Hawaiians."

SEC. 112. FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSIONER.

Section 202(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting "directly" after "(3)",

(2) in paragraph (11) by striking "provide for the coordination of" and insert "coordinate",

(3) in paragraph (18)—

(A) by inserting ", and service providers," after "agencies", and

(B) by striking "the greatest economic or social needs" and inserting "greatest economic need or individuals with greatest so-

cial need, with particular attention to and specific objectives for providing services to low-income minority individuals",

(4) in paragraph (19)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting "or activity" after "service" each place it appears, and

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking "and" at the end,

(5) in paragraph (20) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon,

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(21) establish the National Ombudsman Resource Center, under the administration of the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman, that will—

"(A) by grant or contract—

"(i) conduct research;

"(ii) provide training, technical assistance, and information to State Long-Term Care Ombudsmen; and

"(iii) analyze laws, regulations, programs, and practices;

relating to Federal, State and local long-term care ombudsman policies;

"(B) coordinate efforts to provide information to Federal and State law enforcement authorities regarding violations of laws relating to the elder abuse;

"(C) make recommendations to the Congress and the President or elder abuse policies;

"(D) assist State Long-Term Care Ombudsmen in the implementation of elder abuse programs and abuse prevention strategies;

"(23) make arrangements with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, for the purpose of having the Institute establish within the Institute, not later than 18 months after the effective date of this paragraph, the National Commission on Board and Care Facility Quality that will—

"(A) be administered by the Institute in coordination with the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman, and be directed in its policy by representatives of State and local governments, residents of board and care facilities (and representatives of such residents), private individuals with experience in the long-term care profession or in providing long-term care services, and by Federal policy-making officers who are appointed by the Secretary;

"(B) by grant or contract—

"(i) conduct research; and

"(ii) analyze State and local laws and policies;

relating to board and care facilities; and

"(C) not later than 18 months after the Commission is established, make recommendations to the Congress and the President concerning minimum national standards for the health and safety of residents of board and care facilities; and

"(D) assist State and local entities in the implementation of national, State, and local board and care facility quality standards and abuse prevention strategies;

"(24) not later than June 1, 1992, establish standards applicable to the training required by section 307(a)(12)(H)(iv);

"(25) issue regulations, and conduct strict monitoring of State compliance with the requirements in effect, under this Act to prohibit conflicts of interest and to maintain the integrity and public purpose of services provided and service providers, under this Act in all contractual and commercial relationships, and include in such regulations a requirement that as a condition of being designated as an area agency on aging such agency shall—

"(A) disclose to the Commissioner and the State agency involved—

"(i) the identity of each nongovernmental entity with which such agency has a contract or commercial relationship relating to providing any service to older individuals; and

"(ii) the nature of such contract or such relationship;

"(B) demonstrate that a loss or diminution in the quantity or quality of the services provided, or to be provided, under this Act by such agency has not and will not result from such contract or such relationship;

"(C) demonstrate that the quantity or quality of the services to be provided under this Act by such agency will be enhanced as a result of such contract or such relationship; and

"(D) on the request of the Commissioner or the State, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with this Act (including conducting an audit), disclose all sources and expenditures of funds received or expended to provide services to older individuals; and

"(26) design and implement, for purposes of compliance with paragraph (19), uniform data collection procedures for use by State agencies, including—

"(A) uniform definitions and nomenclature;

"(B) standardized data collection procedures;

"(C) a participant identification and description system; and

"(D) procedures for the assessment of unmet needs for services under this Act.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991, such data collection procedures shall be developed by the Commissioner, jointly with the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation of the Department of Health and Human Services, after requesting advisory information from State agencies, local governments, area agencies on aging, and local providers of services under this Act and after considering the data collection systems carried out by State agencies in the States then identified as exemplary by the General Accounting Office. Not later than 1 year after developing such data collection procedures, the Commissioner shall implement and test such data collection procedures and submit, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, a report summarizing the results of such test."

SEC. 113. FEDERAL AGENCY CONSULTATION.

The first sentence of section 203(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3013(a)) is amended by inserting "coordinate," after "shall".

SEC. 114. FEDERAL COUNCIL ON AGING.

Section 204 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3015) is amended—

(1) in the third sentence of subsection (a)(1) by inserting "from among individuals who have expertise and experience in the field of aging" after "appointed",

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: "and of identifying duplication and gaps among the types of services provided under such programs and activities",

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively, and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) directly advise the Commissioner on matters affecting the special needs of older individuals for services and assistance under this Act;"

(3) in the first sentence of subsection (f) by striking "Beginning" and all that follows through "advisable", and inserting "The Council shall make interim reports to the Commissioner", and

(4) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$300,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995."

SEC. 115. ADMINISTRATION OF ACT.

Section 205 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3016) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (4) by striking "and" at the end,

(B) in paragraph (5) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon, and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) designate an officer or employee with nutritional science and planning expertise, to coordinate and assist—

"(A) the delivery of nutrition services under this Act;

"(B) the implementation of Federal dietary, nutritional, and health services standards for nutritional planning under this Act; and

"(C) the establishment of guidelines for monitoring compliance of such nutritional services with the requirements under this Act; and

"(7) establish a policy, and be responsible for advocating, guiding, coordinating, and assisting under this Act Federal and State efforts to create, opportunities for older individuals to participate in multigenerational activities, such as serving as mentors or advisors to younger individuals.", and

(2) in subsection (c) by striking "1987" and inserting "1991".

SEC. 116. EVALUATION.

Section 206 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3017) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a) by inserting after "related programs," the following:

"their effectiveness in targeting for services under this Act unserved older individuals with greatest economic need (including low-income minority individuals) and unserved older individuals with greatest social need (including low-income minority individuals).", and

(2) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

"(g)(1) Not later than June 30, 1994, the Commissioner, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall complete an evaluation of nutrition services provided under this Act, to evaluate for fiscal years 1992 and 1993—

"(A) their effectiveness in serving special populations of older individuals;

"(B) the quality of nutrition provided by such services;

"(C) average meal costs (including the cost of food, related administrative costs, and the cost of supportive services relating to nutrition services), taking into account regional differences and size of projects;

"(D) the characteristics of participants;

"(E) the applicability of health, safety, and dietary standards;

"(F) the appraisal of such services by recipients;

"(G) the efficiency of delivery and administration of such services;

"(H) the amount, sources, and ultimate uses of funds transferred under section 308(b)(5) to provide such services;

"(I) the amount, sources, and uses of other funds expended to provide such services, in-

cluding the extent to which funds received under this Act are used to generate additional funds to provide such services;

"(J) the degree of nutritional expertise used to plan and manage coordination with other State and local services;

"(K) nonfood cost factors incidental to providing nutrition services under this Act;

"(L) the extent to which commodities provided by the Secretary of Agriculture are used to provide such services;

"(M) and for the 8-year period ending September 30, 1991, the characteristics, and changes in the characteristics, of such nutrition services;

"(N) differences between older individuals who receive nutrition services under section 331 and older individuals who receive nutrition services under section 336, with specific reference to age, income, health status, receipt of food stamp benefits, and limitations on activities of daily living;

"(O) the impact of the increase in nutrition services provided under section 336, the factors that caused such increase, and the effect of such increase on nutrition services authorized under section 336;

"(P) how, and the extent to which, nutrition services provided under this Act generally, and under section 331 specifically, are integrated with long-term care programs;

"(Q) the impact of nutrition services provided under this Act on older individuals, including the impact on their dietary intake and opportunities for socialization; and

"(R) the impact of transferring funds under section 308(b)(5) and how funds transferred under such section are expended to provide nutrition services.

"(2) Not later than September 30, 1994, the Secretary shall—

"(A) submit to President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate recommendations to improve nutrition services provided under this Act; and

"(B) require the Commissioner to implement such recommendations administratively, to the extent feasible.

"(h) The Secretary may use such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed one-third of 1 percent of the funds appropriated under this Act for each fiscal year or \$3,000,000 (whichever is less), to conduct directly evaluations under this section. No part of such sums may be reprogrammed, transferred, or used for any other purpose. Funds expended under this subsection shall be justified and accounted for by the Secretary."

SEC. 117. REPORTS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 207(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3018(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking "and" at the end,

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and", and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) a description of the implementation of the plan required by section 202(a)(17)."

(b) REPORT ON EVALUATIONS.—Section 207(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3018(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking "and" at the end,

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and",

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) the effectiveness of State and local efforts to target older individuals with greatest economic need (including low-income minority individuals) and older individuals with greatest social need (including minor-

ity individuals) to receive services under this Act."

SEC. 118. FEDERAL LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN.

Title II of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011-3020d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"FEDERAL LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN"

"Sec. 214. (a) To assist the Commissioner to carry out section 307(a)(12), there is established in the Administration on Aging the Office of the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman.

"(b) Such Office shall be headed by the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman who shall be appointed by the Commissioner from among individuals who have expertise and background in the field of long-term care. The Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman shall report to the Commissioner.

"(c) The Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman shall—

"(1) advocate, monitor, and coordinate Federal and State activities of long-term care ombudsmen under this Act;

"(2) administer the National Ombudsman Resource Center;

"(3) submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate an annual report on the effectiveness of services provided under section 307(a)(12); and

"(4) have authority to investigate the operation or violation of any Federal law administered by the Department of Health and Human Services that may adversely affect the health, safety, welfare, or rights of older individuals.

"(d)(1) For the purposes of carrying out subsection (c)(4), the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman may—

"(A) issue subpoenas to compel the testimony of witnesses, and the production of documents, at any place in any State;

"(B) administer oaths;

"(C) examine witnesses; and

"(D) receive evidence.

"(2) The Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman shall pay the same fees and mileage that are paid to witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

"(3)(A) A subpoena issued under subparagraph (A) may be served at any place in the United States.

"(B) Such subpoena shall be served in the manner provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the service of subpoenas issued by a district court of the United States.

"(4)(A) If a person to whom a subpoena is issued under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena, the district court of the United States for the judicial district—

"(i) in which the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman is conducting the proceeding involved; or

"(ii) in which such person is found, resides, or transacts business;

may, upon application by the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman, order such person to appear before the Federal Long-Term Care Ombudsman to testify or to produce documents.

"(B) Failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(C) Process of a court to which application is made under this paragraph may be served at any place in the United States."

SEC. 119. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES.

Title II of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011-3020d), as amended by section

118, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"SEC. 215. There are authorized to be appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Administration on Aging—

"(1) \$17,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, \$24,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, \$29,000,000 for fiscal year 1995; and

"(2) such additional sums as may be necessary for each such fiscal year to enable the Commissioner to provide for not fewer than 300 full-time employees (or the equivalent thereof) in the Administration on Aging."

SEC. 120. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON BOARD AND CARE FACILITY QUALITY.

Title II of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011–3020d), as amended by sections 118 and 119, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON BOARD AND CARE FACILITY QUALITY

"SEC. 216. There is authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for operation of the National Commission on Board and Care Quality established under the authority of section 202(a)(23)."

Subtitle C—Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging

SEC. 131. DEFINITIONS.

Section 302 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022), as amended by section 101(b), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—
(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking "and" at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and", and

(C) by adding at the end the following:
"(D) encourage and assist public and private entities that have unrealized potential for meeting the service needs of older individuals to assist the older individuals on a voluntary basis."

(2) in paragraph (4) by inserting "direct" after "under the", and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11), as so redesignated by section 101(b), the following:

"(12) The term 'caregiver' means a family member or other individual who provides (on such individual's behalf or on behalf of a public or private agency, organization, or institution) uncompensated care to an older individual who needs supportive services.

"(13) The term 'eldercare' means a supportive service provided by a caregiver to an older individual, particularly an older individual who is at risk of losing self-sufficiency."

SEC. 132. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; USES OF FUNDS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART B.—

(1) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS.—Section 303(a)(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(1)) is amended by striking "\$379,575,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$439,406,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(2) STATE LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN PROGRAMS.—Section 303(a)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(2)) is amended by striking "\$20,000,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(3) OUTREACH AND RELATED ASSISTANCE.—Section 303(a)(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(3)) is amended by striking "\$10,000,000" the first place it appears and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART C.—

(1) CONGREGATE NUTRITION SERVICES.—Section 303(b)(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(b)(1)) is amended by striking "\$414,750,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$435,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(2) HOME-DELIVERED NUTRITION SERVICES.—Section 303(b)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(b)(2)) is amended by striking "\$79,380,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$120,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SCHOOL-BASED MEALS FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS AND MULTIGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS.—Section 303(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) Subject to subsection (h), there are authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, to carry out subpart 3 of part C of this title (relating to congregate nutrition services and multigenerational activities of schools)."

(c) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART D (RELATING TO IN-HOME SERVICES).—Section 303(d) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(d)) is amended by striking "\$25,000,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$28,941,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(d) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART E (RELATING TO SPECIAL NEEDS).—Section 303(e) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking "are" and inserting "is", and

(2) by striking "\$25,000,000" the first place it appears and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(e) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART F (RELATING TO DISEASE PREVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION).—Section 303(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking "Subject to subsection (h), there" and inserting "There", and

(2) by striking "\$5,000,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(f) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART G (RELATING TO ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS).—Section 303(g) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(g)) is amended by striking "\$5,000,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995".

(g) LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 303(h) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023(h)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(a)(3)",

(2) by striking "(e), (f)," and inserting "(b)(3), (e),".

(3) by striking ", F,".

(4) by striking "306(a)(6)(P), 307(a)(12)," and inserting "307(a)(12)",

(5) by inserting "subpart 3 of part C," after "311," and

(6) by striking "105 percent" and inserting "102 percent".

(h) AUTHORIZATION FOR PART H (RELATING TO SUPPORTIVE ACTIVITIES FOR CAREGIVERS).—Section 303 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) There are authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, to carry out part H (relating to supportive activities for caregivers)."

SEC. 133. ALLOTMENT; FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 304(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking "1984" and inserting "1987",

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking "\$50,000" and inserting "\$150,000", and

(3) in paragraph (4) by striking "satisfactory data" and inserting "data available from the Bureau of the Census, and other reliable demographic data satisfactory to the Commissioner,".

SEC. 134. ORGANIZATION.

Section 305(a)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3025(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting "(as specified in section 202(a)(19))" after "statistics",

(B) by inserting "in the State" after "distribution", and

(C) by striking "individuals aged 60 and older in the State" and inserting the following:

"older individuals, low-income older individuals, frail older individuals, and low-income minority older individuals, and the access of such individuals (particularly individuals residing in rural areas) to services under this title", and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by striking "the greatest economic or social needs" and inserting "greatest economic need (with particular attention to low-income minority individuals) and individuals with greatest social need", and

(B) by inserting a comma after "individuals)".

SEC. 135. AREA PLANS.

Section 306(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3026(a))—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting "eldercare," after "nutrition services",

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting "and facilities operated by organizations referred to in paragraph (6)(D)(ii)" after "centers", and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following:

", and specify in grants, contracts, and agreements implementing such plan the identity of each focal point so designated",

(3) in paragraph (5)

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i) by striking "particular attention" and inserting "specific objectives for providing services", and

(ii) by amending clause (ii)(II) to read as follows:

"(II) to the maximum extent feasible, provide services to low-income minority individuals in accordance with their need for such services; and",

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting "frail individuals," after "elderly", and

(ii) by inserting "and caregivers" after "such individuals";

(4) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by inserting "and timely information" after "assistance";

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting "(in cooperation with agencies, local governments, organizations, and individuals participating in activities under the area plan)" after "the community";

(ii) by adding "and" at the end;

(iii) by inserting "(i)" after "(D)"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(i) promote the development in each community in the planning and service area of coalitions, comprised of individuals representing local governments, business and labor organizations, educational and religious organization, fraternal and civic associations, and community and nonprofit organizations that have the objective of implementing an action plan for eldercare designed to mobilize additional resources to meet the home- and community-based needs of older individuals at risk of losing their self-sufficiency;"

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by inserting "(i)" after "(E)";

(ii) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) where possible regarding the provision of services under this title, enter into arrangements and coordinate with organizations which—

"(I) were officially designated as community action agencies or community action programs under section 210 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for fiscal year 1981; or

"(II) came into existence during fiscal year 1982 as a direct successors in interest to such community action agencies or community action programs;

and meet the requirements under section 675(c)(3) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, unless such organizations lost their designation under such section 210 as a result of failure to comply with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;"

(D) in subparagraph (I) by inserting "and eldercare" after "care services";

(E) in subparagraph (O) by striking "and" at the end; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

"(Q) identify the needs of older individuals and describe methods the area agency will use to coordinate planning and delivery of transportation services (including the purchase of vehicles) to assist older individuals, including those with special needs, in the area; and

"(R) enter into voluntary arrangements with nonprofit entities that provide housing (such as housing under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and under other public and private housing authorities) to older individuals, to provide—

"(i) leadership and coordination in the development, provision, and expansion of adequate housing, supportive services, referrals, and living arrangements for older individuals; and

"(ii) advance notification and nonfinancial assistance to older individuals who are subject to eviction from such housing;"

(5) in paragraph (9) by striking "and" at the end;

(6) in paragraph (10) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

"(11) provide assurances that any amount received under part H will be expended in accordance with such part;

"(12) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will—

"(A) maintain the integrity and public purpose of services provided, and service providers, under this title in all contractual and commercial relationships;

"(B) disclose to the Commissioner and the State agency—

"(i) the identity of each nongovernmental entity with which such agency has a contract or commercial relationship relating to providing any service to older individuals; and

"(ii) the nature of such contract or such relationship;

"(C) demonstrate that a loss or diminution in the quantity or quality of the services provided, or to be provided, under this title by such agency has not and will not result from such contract or such relationship;

"(D) demonstrate that the quantity or quality of the services to be provided under this title by such agency will be enhanced as a result of such contract or such relationship; and

"(E) on the request of the Commissioner or the State, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with this Act (including conducting an audit), disclose all sources and expenditures of funds such agency receives or expends to provide services to older individuals;

"(13) provide assurances that funds received under this title will not be used to pay any part of a cost (including an administrative cost) incurred by the area agency to carry out a contract or commercial relationship that is not carried out to implement this title;

"(14) provide assurances that preference in receiving services under this title will not be given by the area agency on aging to particular older individuals as a result of a contract or commercial relationship that is not carried out to implement this title;

"(15) provide assurances that projects in the area will be given nutritional assistance and guidance to reasonably accommodate participants as described in section 307(a)(13)(G); and

"(16) provide assurances that the area agency will, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate the services it provides under this title with services provided under title VI."

SEC. 136. STATE PLANS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS OF PLAN.—Section 307(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3072(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting "the succeeding sentence and" after "provided in";

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following:

"If the Commissioner determines, in the discretion of the Commissioner, that a State failed in 2 successive years to comply with the requirements under this title, then the State shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan for a 1-year period that meets such criteria, for subsequent years until the Commissioner determines that the State is in compliance with such requirements."

(3) in paragraph (3)(A) by inserting "and transportation" after "legal";

(4) in paragraph (5) by adding at the end the following:

"The State agency shall establish and publish procedures for requesting and conducting such hearing."

(5) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting "(A)" after "(7)", and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) The plan shall provide assurances that—

"(i) no individual (appointed or otherwise) involved in the designation of the State agency or an area agency on aging, or in the designation of the head of any subdivision of the State agency or of an area agency on aging, is subject to a conflict of interest prohibited under this Act;

"(ii) no officer, employee, or other representative of the State agency or an area agency on aging is subject to a conflict of interest prohibited under this Act; and

"(iii) mechanisms are in place to identify and remove conflicts of interest prohibited under this Act.

"(C) The plan shall provide assurances that the State agency and each area agency on aging will—

"(i) maintain the integrity and public purpose of services provided, and service providers, under the State plan in all contractual and commercial relationships;

"(ii) disclose to the Commissioner—

"(I) the identity of each nongovernmental entity with which the State agency or area agency on aging has a contract or commercial relationship relating to providing any service to older individuals; and

"(II) the nature of such contract or such relationship;

"(iii) demonstrate that a loss or diminution in the quantity or quality of the services provided, or to be provided, under this Act by such agency has not and will not result from such contract or such relationship;

"(iv) demonstrate that the quantity or quality of the services to be provided under the State plan will be enhanced as a result of such contract or such relationship; and

"(v) on the request of the Commissioner, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with this Act (including conducting an audit), disclose all sources and expenditures of funds the State agency and area agency on aging receive or expend to provide services to older individuals."

(6) in paragraph (11) by striking "governments," and all that follows through "older", and inserting the following:

"governments—

"(A) preference shall be given to older individuals; and

"(B) special consideration shall be given to individuals with formal training in the field of aging (including an educational specialty or emphasis in aging and a training degree or certificate in aging) or equivalent professional experience in the field of aging;"

(7) in paragraph (12)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking "program which provides" and all that follows through "basis—", and inserting the following:

"program. The Office shall be headed by an individual who has expertise and experience in the field of long-term care and shall be known as the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman. The State Long-Term Care Ombudsman, personally or through other representatives of the Office, shall—"

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking "staff and volunteers and promote" and inserting "representatives of the Office and promote";

(iii) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (vi) and (vii), respectively, and

(iv) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

"(ii) provide services to assist such residents to protect their health, safety, well-being, and rights;

"(iii) ensure that such residents have regular and timely access to the services pro-

vided through the Office and receive from representatives of the Office timely responses to requests for such services;

"(iv) provide representation of such residents' interests through administrative, legal, and other actions;

"(v) provide administrative and technical assistance to entities designated under subparagraph (H)(vi) to assist such entities to participate in the State long-term care ombudsman program;"

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "establish" and all that follows through "including", and inserting the following:

"ensure that representatives of the Office have immediate access to residents of long-term care facilities and have appropriate access to the records of such residents. Upon receipt of complaints, the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman personally shall have immediate access to such records of residents. The State agency shall establish procedures applicable to such access and";

(ii) by striking "written", and

(iii) by inserting after "resident" the last place it appears the following:

"(given in writing, or given orally by such complainant or resident and documented contemporaneously in a writing made by a representative of the Office in accordance with requirements the State agency shall establish)";

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(I) by striking "to assure" and all that follows through "such files", and inserting the following:

"relating to the disclosure of files maintained by the ombudsman program and providing that such files may be disclosed only at the discretion of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman (or the designee of such Ombudsman) and only in accordance with such procedures"; and

(II) by striking "by such ombudsman",

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by inserting "there is consent by" after "(i)", and

(II) by striking ", consents in writing" and inserting the following:

"(given in writing, or given orally by such complainant, resident, or representative and documented contemporaneously in a writing made by a representative of the Office in accordance with requirements the State agency shall establish)";

(D) in subparagraph (H)—

(i) in clause (iii)—

(I) by inserting "(I)" after "(iii)",

(II) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end, and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

"(II) make available to the public, and submit to the Commissioner, the chief executive officer of the State, the State legislature, the State agency responsible for licensing or certifying long-term care facilities, and other appropriate governmental entities, each report prepared under clause (i);", and

(i) in clause (iv) by inserting ", in accordance with the standards in effect under section 202(a)(24)", after "provide", and

(E) in subparagraph (J)—

(i) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking "employee for having filed" and inserting "other person for filing", and

(II) by striking "or providing information to," and inserting "providing information to, or otherwise cooperating with any representative of", and

(i) in clause (iv)(I) by inserting "immediate" after "(I)",

(8) in paragraph (13)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i) by inserting "(other than section 303(b)(3))" after "this title",

(B) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by striking "may" and inserting "will", and

(ii) by inserting "dietitians," after "advice of",

(C) in subparagraph (H) by striking "and" at the end,

(D) in subparagraph (I) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon, and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

"(J) the State agency will monitor, coordinate, and assist in the planning of nutritional services, with the advice of a dietitian; and

"(K) the State agency will—

"(i) develop nonfinancial criteria for eligibility to receive nutrition services under section 336; and

"(ii) periodically evaluate recipients of such services to determine whether they continue to meet such criteria.";

(9) in paragraph (15)(A)—

(A) by striking "and (iii)" and inserting "(iii)", and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", and (iv) give priority to providing legal assistance relating to income, health care, long-term care, nutrition, housing, utilities, protective services, and age discrimination";

(10) in paragraph (16)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking "that whenever" and all that follows through "individuals—", and inserting "assurances that with respect to services to prevent elder abuse—";

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking "the plan contains assurances that", and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking "unless" and all that follows through "agency.", and inserting the following:

"unless—

"(i) all parties to such complaint consent in writing to the release of such information;

"(ii) the release of such information is to a law enforcement agency, public protective service agency, licensing, or certification agency, ombudsman program, or protection or advocacy system; or

"(iii) upon court order.";

(11) in paragraph (26) by inserting "and eldercare" after "care services",

(12) in paragraph (31)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking "for fiscal year 1989"; and

(B) in clause (i) by striking "(as defined in section 302(20))" and inserting "and individuals with greatest social need", and

(13) by adding at the end the following:

"(32) The plan shall provide assurances that funds received under this title will not be used to pay any part of a cost (including an administrative cost) incurred by the State or an area agency on aging to carry out a contract or commercial relationship that is not carried out to implement this title.

"(33) The plan shall provide assurances that preference in receiving services under this title will not be given by the area agency on aging to particular older individuals as a result of a contract or commercial relationship that is not carried out to implement this title.

"(34) The plan shall provide assurances that special efforts will be made to provide technical assistance to minority providers of services under this title.

"(35) The plan—

"(A) shall include the statement and the demonstration required by paragraphs (2) and (4) of section 305(d); and

"(B) may not be approved unless the Commissioner approves such statement and such demonstration.

"(36) The plan shall provide assurances that if the State receives funds appropriated under section 303(i) the State agency and area agencies on aging will expend such funds to carry out part H.

"(37) The plan shall provide assurances that demonstrable efforts will be made—

"(A) to coordinate services provided under this Act with other State services which benefit older individuals; and

"(B) to provide multigenerational activities, such as opportunities for older individuals to serve as mentors or advisors in childcare, daycare, educational assistance, at-risk youth intervention, juvenile delinquency treatment, and family support programs);

"(38) The plan shall provide assurances that the state will coordinate public services within the state to assist older individuals to obtain transportation services associated with access to services provided under this title, services under titles III and VI, comprehensive counseling services, and legal assistance.

"(39) The plan shall provide that the State agency will provide for an informal procedure to review, on the request of an older individual, a refusal to provide to such individual a service under this title."

(b) APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN.—Section 307(b)(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3017(b)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", except the Commissioner may not approve such plan unless the Commissioner determines that the formula submitted under section 305(a)(2)(D) complies with the guidelines in effect under section 305(a)(2)(C)".

(c) DETERMINATION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Section 307(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(c)", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Not later than 30 days after such final determination, a State dissatisfied with such final determination may appeal such final determination to the Secretary for review. If the State timely appeals such final determination in accordance with subsection (e)(1), the Secretary shall dismiss the appeal filed under this paragraph.

"(3) If the State is dissatisfied with the decision of the Secretary after review under paragraph (2), the State may appeal such decision not later than 30 days after such decision and in the manner described in subsection (e). For purposes of appellate review under the preceding sentence, a reference in subsection (e) to the Commissioner shall be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary."

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 307 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(e) PROTECTION OF COMMERCIAL INFORMATION.—Section 307(g) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(g)" and inserting "(f)(1)", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Information disclosed under section 306(12)(B)(i) or subsection (a)(7)(C)(ii)(I) may be disclosed to the public by the State agency or the State only if such information could be disclosed under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, by an agency of the United States."

SEC. 137. PLANNING, COORDINATION, EVALUATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS.

Section 308 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3028) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3) by inserting "been" after "which has", and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the first sentence of paragraph (4)—
(i) by striking "received under section 303(b)(1) and (2), a" and inserting "received by a State and attributable to funds appropriated under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 303(b), the", and

(ii) by striking "a portion of the funds appropriated" and inserting "not more than 30 percent of such funds", and

(B) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title and except as provided in subparagraph (B), of the funds received by a State attributable to funds appropriated under subsection (a)(1), and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), of section 303, the State may elect to transfer not more than 30 percent for fiscal year 1992, not more than 25 percent for fiscal year 1993, not more than 25 percent for fiscal year 1994, and not more than 20 percent for fiscal year 1995, between programs under part B and part C, for use as the State considers appropriate. The State shall notify the Commissioner of any such election.
(B) If a State demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, that funds available under this title (including funds transferred under subparagraph (A) without regard to this subparagraph) for fiscal year 1993, 1994, or 1995 are insufficient to satisfy the need for services under this title, then the Commissioner may grant a waiver that permits the State to transfer under subparagraph (A) to satisfy such need an additional 5 percent of the funds so received for such fiscal year."

SEC. 138. DISASTER RELIEF REIMBURSEMENTS.
Subsections (a)(2) and (b) of section 310 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030) are each amended—
(1) by striking "5 percent" each place it appears and inserting "2 percent", and
(2) by striking "for carrying out the purposes of section 422" each place it appears and inserting "to carry out title IV".

SEC. 139. AVAILABILITY OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES.

Section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4)—

(A) in the first sentence by inserting "(A)" after "(4)",
(B) by striking "56.76 cents" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "65.66 cents per meal, as adjusted in accordance with subparagraph (B), during fiscal years 1992 through 1995", and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) For each of the fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, the annually programmed level of assistance required by subparagraph (A) shall be the annually programmed level of assistance required under such subparagraph for the preceding fiscal year adjusted to reflect—
(i) an increase of 2 percent; or
(ii) the percentage increase (if any) in the food-away-from-home component of the Consumer Price Index For All Urban Consumers (published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) during the 1-year period ending July 1 preceding the fiscal year for which the adjustment is made;
whichever is greater.", and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A) by striking "\$151,000,000" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, \$310,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, \$380,000,000 for fiscal year 1994, and \$460,000,000 for fiscal year 1995".

SEC. 140. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS.
Section 321(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)) is amended—
(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", including language translation services to assist older individuals with limited-English speaking ability to obtain services under this title",
(2) in paragraph (4)—
(A) by striking "or (C)" and inserting "(C)", and
(B) by inserting "; or (D) to receive applications from older individuals for housing under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959" before the semicolon at the end,
(3) in paragraph (6)—
(A) by inserting ", a variety of advice and informational services about the rights of older individuals (including information and referral on legal matters)," after "legal assistance", and
(B) by inserting "(including counseling relating to pension rights and benefits)" after "financial counseling", and
(4) in paragraph (17) by inserting ", including information concerning prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of age-related diseases" before the semicolon at the end.

SEC. 141. SCHOOL-BASED MEALS FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS AND MULTIGENERATIONAL PROGRAMS.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030e-3030g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subpart 3—School-Based Meals for Older Individuals and Multigenerational Programs
"PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 338. The Commissioner shall carry out a program for making grants to States under State plans approved under section 307 for the establishment and operation of projects that—
(1) are carried out in elementary and secondary schools;
(2) provide to older individuals hot meals, each of which assures a minimum of one-third of the dietary allowances as established by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, at such schools—
(A) while such schools are in session;
(B) during the summer; and
(C) unless waived by the State involved, on the weekdays in the school year when such schools are not in session;
(3) provide multigenerational activities in which older individuals and students interact at such schools;
(4) provide social and recreational activities for older individuals at such schools;
(5) develop and maintain 'skill banks' in which information on the skills and preferred activities of older individuals is maintained and made available to school officials for purposes of providing opportunities for such individuals to serve as tutors, teacher aids, living historians, special speakers, playground supervisors, lunchroom assistants, and assistants in such schools; and
(6) provide opportunities for older individuals to participate in school activities (such as classes, dramatic programs, and assemblies) and use school facilities (such as cafeterias, libraries, gymnasiums, and auditoriums).

"APPLICATION AND SELECTION OF PROVIDERS
"SEC. 339. (a) To be eligible to carry out a project under the program established under section 338 by the Commissioner, an entity shall submit an application to the State agency designated under section 305(a)(1). Such application shall include—
(1) a plan describing the project proposed by the applicant and comments, obtained from the appropriate area agency on aging and the appropriate local educational agency, on such plan;
(2) an assurance that funds received from subpart 3 through the State agency to carry out such project will be expended for not more than 85 percent of the cost of carrying out such project;
(3) an assurance that not less than 15 percent of such costs shall be paid, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal sources;
(4) a demonstration of the need for such project, including a description of—
(A) the nutrition services and other services currently provided under this Act in the geographical area to be served by such project; and
(B) how such project will be coordinated with such services; and
(5) such other information and assurances as the Commissioner may require by rule.
(b) SELECTION AMONG APPLICANTS.—In selecting among entities that submit applications under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, the State agency shall—
(1) first, give priority to entities that carried out a project under this subpart in the preceding fiscal year;
(2) second, give priority to entities that carried out a nutrition project under subpart 1 in the preceding fiscal year; and
(3) third, give priority to entities whose applications include a plan that involves a school with greatest need (as evidenced by such facts as the dropout rate, the level of substance abuse, and the number of children who have limited English-speaking ability or who participate in programs under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or the National School Lunch Act).

"REPORTS BY STATES
"SEC. 339A. (a) Not later than 60 days after the end of a fiscal year for which a State receives a grant under this subpart, such State shall submit to the Commissioner a report evaluating the projects carried out under this subpart by such State in such fiscal year. Such report shall include a description of—
(1) who was served in such project;
(2) which multigenerational activities were carried out in such project;
(3) additional needs of older individuals and students; and
(4) any appropriate modification of such project to satisfy such needs.
(b) Not later than 120 days after each fiscal year for which funds are appropriated to carry out this subpart the Commissioner shall submit to the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report summarizing, with respect to each State, the reports submitted under subsection (a) for such fiscal year."
(c) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Section 303(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023(c)) is amended—
(1) by striking "parts B and C" and inserting "part B, and subparts 1 and 2 of part C", and
(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting "under subparts 1 and 2 of part C" after "nutrition services".

SEC. 142. PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of part F of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030m–3030o) is amended to read as follows:

"PART F—DISEASE PREVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION SERVICES".

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Section 361 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030m) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "for periodic" and all that follows through "appropriate", and inserting the following:

"to provide disease prevention and health promotion services (including information) at senior centers and other appropriate sites, and through programs that provide nutrition services under part C", and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "Preventive health" and inserting "Disease prevention and health promotion", and

(B) by striking "Medicare" and inserting "title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.)".

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 363 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030o) is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 363. For purposes of this part, the term 'disease prevention and health promotion services' means—

"(1) health risk assessments;

"(2) routine health and nutrition screening, including hypertension, glaucoma, cholesterol, cancer, vision, and hearing screening;

"(3) nutritional counseling and educational services;

"(4) health promotion programs, including programs specifically relating to osteoporosis and cardiovascular disease prevention, alcohol abuse reduction, smoking cessation, weight loss and control, and stress management;

"(5) group exercise programs;

"(6) home injury control services, including screening of high-risk home environments and provision of educational programs on injury prevention in the home environment (including fall and fracture prevention);

"(7) screening for the prevention of depression, coordination of community mental health services, provision of educational activities, and referral to psychiatric and psychological services;

"(8) educational programs on the availability of benefits payable under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) for preventive health services;

"(9) medication management screening and education to prevent incorrect medication and adverse drug reactions;

"(10) information concerning diagnosis, prevention and treatment of age-related diseases, including osteoporosis, cardiovascular diseases and Alzheimer's disease; and

"(11) counseling regarding social services and followup health services based on any of the services described in paragraphs (1) through (10)."

SEC. 143. PREVENTION OF ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS.

Section 371 of the Older Americans Act 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030p) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting "through the National Center on Elder Abuse," after "out" the first place it appears,

(2) in paragraph (2)(C) by striking "conferences," and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking "or" at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or", and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) upon court order."

SEC. 144. SUPPORTIVE ACTIVITIES FOR CAREGIVERS WHO PROVIDE IN-HOME SERVICES TO FRAIL OLDER INDIVIDUALS.

Title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021–3030p) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART H—SUPPORTIVE ACTIVITIES FOR CAREGIVERS WHO PROVIDE IN-HOME SERVICES TO FRAIL OLDER INDIVIDUALS

"PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 381. The Commissioner shall carry out a program for making grants to States under State plans approved under section 307 to carry out a program to provide supportive activities for caregivers who provide in-home services to frail older individuals. Such supportive activities may include—

"(1) providing training and counseling for such caregivers;

"(2) technical assistance to such caregivers to assist them to form or to participate in support groups;

"(3) providing information—

"(A) to frail older individuals and their families regarding how to obtain in-home services and respite services; and

"(B) to caregivers who provide such services, regarding—

"(i) how to provide such services; and

"(ii) sources of nonfinancial support available to them as a result of their providing such services; and

"(4) maintaining lists of individuals who provide respite services for the families of frail older individuals.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 382. For purposes of this part, the term 'in-home services' has the meaning given such terms in section 342.

"MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

"SEC. 383. Section 344 shall apply with respect to funds made available under this part, in the same manner as such section applies to funds made available under part D."

Subtitle D—Training, Research, and Discretionary Projects and Programs

SEC. 161. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

Section 401 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030aa) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting "and for public dissemination, to replicate such programs and services under this Act" after "individuals".

SEC. 162. ADMINISTRATION.

Section 402 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030bb) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) The Commissioner shall ensure that grants and contracts awarded under this title—

"(1) are evaluated for their benefit to older individuals, to programs under this Act; and

"(2) comply with the requirements under this Act."

SEC. 163. GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

Section 411(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3031(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting "gerontology," after "(including mental health) care," and

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting "and counseling" after "nutrition".

SEC. 164. MULTIDISCIPLINARY CENTERS OF GERONTOLOGY.

Section 412(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting "counseling services," after "maintenance," and

(2) in paragraph (4) by inserting "social work," after "education,".

SEC. 165. CAREER PREPARATION FOR THE FIELD OF AGING.

Part A of title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3032) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"CAREER PREPARATION FOR THE FIELD OF AGING

"SEC. 413. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to institutions of higher education, historically Black colleges or universities, Hispanic Centers of Excellence in Health Professions Education, and other educational institutions that serve the needs of minority students, to provide education and training to prepare students for careers in the field of aging.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) the term 'Hispanic Centers of Excellence in Health Professions Education' has the meaning given such term in section 782(d)(2) of the Public Health Service Act;

"(2) the term 'historically Black college or university' has the meaning given the term 'part B institution' in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

"(3) the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965."

SEC. 166. PENSION INFORMATION AND COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

Part A of title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030aa–3032), as amended by section 165, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PENSION INFORMATION AND COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 414. (a) The Commissioner may make grants to public agencies, and nonprofit private organizations, with a creditable record of providing pension information and counseling, to carry out demonstration projects to provide to older individuals information, counseling, referral, and similar assistance relating to pension benefits. In selecting recipients of such grants, the Commissioner shall consider the advice of representatives of businesses, of labor organizations, and of national organizations that advocate the well-being of older individuals.

"(b) The Commissioner may make grants to public agencies and nonprofit private organizations that have experience in providing nationwide information, referral, and advocacy services relating to retirement income and pension matters, to provide pension-related training and information to staff of focal points."

SEC. 167. FORECLOSURE AND EVICTION ASSISTANCE AND RELIEF SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

Part A of title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030aa–3032), as amended by sections 165 and 166, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"FORECLOSURE AND EVICTION ASSISTANCE AND RELIEF SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 415. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to States to carry out demonstration projects to develop methods or implement laws—

"(1) to prevent or delay the foreclosure on housing owned and occupied by older individuals and the eviction of older individuals from housing they rent;

"(2) to obtain alternative housing as a result of such foreclosure or eviction; and

"(3) to assist older individuals to understand their rights and obligations under laws relating to housing ownership and occupancy.

"(b) A State that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall establish methods, including a notification process—

"(1) to assist older individuals who are incapable of understanding the circumstances and consequences of foreclosure on or eviction from housing they occupy; and

"(2) to coordinate the project for which such grant is received with the activities of tenant organizations, tenant-landlord mediation organizations, public housing entities, and area agencies on aging, to provide more effectively assistance or referral to services to relocate or prevent eviction of older individuals from housing they occupy.

"(c) Each State that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall submit to the Commissioner an evaluation of the project carried out with such grant.

"(d) The Commissioner shall submit, as part of the annual report submitted under section 207, a report on the evaluations received under subsection (c) and shall include in such report such recommendations as the Commissioner considers to be appropriate."

SEC. 168. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

Section 422 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3035a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking "preventive health" and inserting "disease prevention and health promotion", and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (8) by striking "and" at the end,

(B) in paragraph (9) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and", and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(10) meet the needs of older individuals who provide uncompensated care to their adult children with disabilities, for supportive services relating to such care, including—

"(A) respite services; and

"(B) legal advice, information, and referral services to assist such older individuals with permanency planning for such children."

SEC. 169. SPECIAL PROJECTS IN COMPREHENSIVE LONG-TERM CARE.

The second sentence of section 423(a)(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3035b(a)(3)) is amended by striking "preventive health services" and inserting "disease prevention and health promotion services; rehabilitative services".

SEC. 170. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Part B of title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3034-3035g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 429. The Commissioner shall make grants and enter into contracts, to carry out demonstration projects to provide for older individuals multigenerational activities, such as opportunities to serve as mentors or advisors in child care, daycare, educational assistance, at-risk youth intervention, juvenile delinquency treatment, and family support programs."

SEC. 171. PRIVATE RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS.

Part B of title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3034-3035g), as amended by section 170, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PRIVATE RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

"SEC. 430. (a)(1) The Commissioner may make grants to State agencies designated under section 305(a)(1) and area agencies on aging designated under section 305(a)(2), to carry out demonstration projects that generate non-Federal resources (including cash and in-kind contributions), in order to increase resources available to provide additional services under title III.

"(2) Resources generated with a grant made under subsection (a) shall be in addition to, and may not be used to supplant, any resource that is or would otherwise be available under any Federal, State, or local law to a State, State agency, or unit of general purpose local government to provide such services.

"(3) Resources generated with a grant made under subsection (a) shall be used to provide supportive services in accordance with title III. The requirements under this Act that apply to funds received under title III by States to carry out title III shall apply with respect to such resources.

"(b)(1) The Commissioner shall ensure that States and area agencies in all standard Federal regions of the United States, established by the Office of Management and Budget, receive grants and contracts under subsection (a) on an equitable basis.

"(2) Within such regions, the Commissioner shall give preference to applicants that provide services under title III in geographical areas that contain a large number of older individuals with greatest economic need or individuals with greatest social need.

"(c) The Commissioner shall monitor how—

"(1) grants are expended, and contracts are carried out, under subsection (a); and

"(2) resources generated under such grants and contracts are expended; to ensure compliance with this section."

SEC. 172. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORIZATION.—Section 431(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3037(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "427 and 428" and all that follows through "1991", and inserting "413, 414, 415, 427, 428, 429, and 430" \$72,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995",

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "1989" and inserting "1992", and

(B) by striking the last sentence,

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking "is" and inserting "are", and

(B) by striking "\$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1989 and 1990" and inserting "\$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995",

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively,

(5) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995 to carry out the provisions of section 413.

"(3) Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995 to carry out the provisions of section 414.

"(4) Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995 to carry out the provisions of section 415.", and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995 to carry out the provisions of section 429.

"(8) Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995 to carry out the provisions of section 430."

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATION.—Section 431(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3037(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "427 and 428" and inserting "413, 414, 415, 427, 428, 429, and 430", and

(2) by striking "105 percent" and inserting "102 percent".

SEC. 173. RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMISSIONER.

Section 433 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3037b) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Not later than January 1 following each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall submit, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, a report for such fiscal year that describes each project—

"(A) for which funds were provided under this title; and

"(B) that was completed in the fiscal year for which such report is prepared;

"(2) Such report shall contain—

"(A) the name or descriptive title of each project;

"(B) the name and address of the person or governmental entity that conducted such project;

"(C) a specification of the period throughout which such project was conducted;

"(D) the identity of each source of funds expended to carry out such project and the amount of funds provided by each such source;

"(E) an abstract describing the nature and operation of such project; and

"(F) a bibliography identifying all published information relating to such project.", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c)(1) The Commissioner shall establish by regulation and implement a process to evaluate the results of projects and programs carried out under this title.

"(2) The Commissioner shall—

"(A) make available to the public each evaluation carried out under paragraph (1); and

"(B) use such evaluation to improve services delivered, or the operation of programs and projects carried out, under this Act."

Subtitle E—Community Service Employment for Older Americans

SEC. 181. OLDER AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

Section 502 of the Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting "who have poor employment prospects and" after "persons";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (M) by inserting ", and eligible individuals who have greatest economic need, at least" after "individuals",

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (N) and (O) as subparagraphs (O) and (P), respectively, and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (M) the following:

"(N)(i) will prepare an assessment of—

"(I) the participants' skills and talents;

"(II) their need for supportive services described in section 321(a); and

"(III) their physical capabilities; except to the extent such project has, for the particular participant involved, an assessment of such skills and talents, such need, or such capabilities prepared recently pursuant to another employment or training program (such as the Job Training Partnership Act or the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act);

"(ii) will provide to eligible individuals training and employment counseling based on strategies that identify appropriate employment objectives and the need for supportive services described in section 321(a), developed as a result of the assessment provided for in clause (i); and

"(iii) will provide counseling to participants on their progress in meeting such objectives and satisfying their need for supportive services described in section 321(a);"

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking "Director of the Office of Community Services of the Department" and inserting "Secretary";

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking "1987" and inserting "1991";

(ii) in subparagraph (A) by striking "may" and inserting "shall"; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(i) by inserting after "goals," the following:

"costs associated with coordinating projects under this title with employment and training programs under other Acts, costs associated with subparagraphs (N) and (O) of subsection (b)(1)."; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"Not later than 60 days after receiving a request from such agency or organization to make a determination under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary shall make such determination."

(4) in subsection (d) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) Whenever a national organization or other program sponsor conducts a project under this title in the planning and service area of an area agency on aging designated under section 305(a)(2), such organization or program sponsor shall coordinate, to the maximum extent practicable, such project with the delivery of services provided in such area by such agency."; and

(5) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "Not" and all that follows through "1981, the", and inserting "The", and

(ii) by inserting ", and amend from time to time," after "issue";

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and" at the end,

(C) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and";

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) require the coordination of projects carried out under such agreements, with the programs carried out under section 124 of the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended from time to time."

SEC. 182. ADMINISTRATION.

The first sentence of section 503(b)(1) of the Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "If" and all that follows through "authorized to", and inserting "The Secretary shall";

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following:

"The Secretary shall coordinate the administration of this title with the administration of titles III, IV, and VI by the Commissioner on Aging, to increase the likelihood

that eligible individuals for whom employment opportunities under this title are available and who need services under such titles receive such services."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"The preceding sentence shall not be construed to prohibit carrying out projects under this title jointly with programs, projects, or activities under any Act specified in such sentence."

SEC. 183. INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.

Section 505 of the Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "of the Administration", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(d)(1) The Secretary shall promote and coordinate carrying out projects under this title jointly with programs, projects, or activities under other Acts that provide training and employment opportunities to eligible individuals.

"(2) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Education to promote and coordinate carrying out projects under this title jointly with employment and training programs in which eligible individuals may participate that are carried out under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act."

SEC. 184. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 506(c) of the Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056d(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and (2)" and inserting "(2)", and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following:

", and (3) the relative distribution of such individuals who are individuals with greatest economic need, minority individuals, and individuals with greatest social need".

SEC. 185. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 508(a) of the Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056f(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) \$470,671,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995; and";

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "62,500" and inserting "70,000"; and

(3) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph".

SEC. 186. DUAL ELIGIBILITY.

The Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056-3056g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"DUAL ELIGIBILITY"

"SEC. 510. In the case of projects under this title carried out jointly with programs carried out under the Job Training Partnership Act, eligible individuals shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 203 such Act applicable to adults, as amended from time to time."

SEC. 187. TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED UNDER THE OLDER AMERICAN COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT.

The Older American Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056-3056g), as amended by section 186, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED UNDER THIS TITLE"

"SEC. 511. Assistance furnished under this title shall not be construed to be financial assistance described in section 245A(h)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

Subtitle F—Grants for Native Americans

SEC. 191. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

Section 613 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057d) is amended—

(1) by striking "The" and inserting "(a) Subject to subsection (b), the", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) The Commissioner may not make a grant under subsection (a) in a particular fiscal year to an applicant that did not receive a grant under subsection (a) in fiscal year 1991 unless—

"(1) the Commissioner makes a grant under subsection (a) in such particular fiscal year to each eligible tribal organization—

"(A) that received a grant under subsection (a) in fiscal year 1991; and

"(B) whose application submitted under section 614(a) for such particular fiscal year is approved under section 614(c); and

"(2) the amount of the grant described in paragraph (1) is not less than the amount of the grant made under subsection (a) by the Commissioner in fiscal year 1991 to the tribal organization."

SEC. 192. APPLICATIONS BY TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) CONTENTS OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 614(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057e(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10) by striking "and" at the end,

(2) in paragraph (11) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(12) contain assurances that the tribal organization will coordinate services provided under this part with services provided under title III in the same geographical area."

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO APPROVE APPLICATIONS.—Section 614(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057e(c)) is amended by striking "The Commission" and inserting "Subject to section 613(b), the Commissioner".

SEC. 193. APPLICATIONS BY ORGANIZATIONS SERVING NATIVE HAWAIIANS.

Section 624(a)(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057j) is amended by inserting "and with the activities carried out under title III in the same geographical area" before the semicolon at the end.

SEC. 194. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 633 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3057n) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 633. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, to carry out this title (other than section 615).

"(b) Of the amount appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year—

"(1) 90 percent shall be available to carry out part A; and

"(2) 10 percent shall be available to carry out part B."

Subtitle G—Technical Corrections

SEC. 198. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001-3057n) is amended—

(1) in section 101(8) by striking "the vulnerable elderly" and inserting "vulnerable older individuals";

(2) in section 201(c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraphs (A)(i), (B), (E), (F), and (G) by inserting "individuals who are" after "older" the first place it appears in each of such subparagraphs,

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking "older Native Americans" the last place it appears and inserting "such individuals", and

(C) in subparagraph (E) by striking "the Act" and inserting "this Act",

(3) in section 202—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking "the elderly" each place it appears and inserting "older individuals",

(ii) in paragraph (15)—

(I) by striking "the elderly" and inserting "older individuals", and

(II) by striking "older people" and inserting "such individuals", and

(iii) in paragraphs (13), (15), (16), and (17) by striking "purposes" and inserting "objectives",

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking "with health systems agencies designated under section 1515 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 3001-4)", and

(ii) in paragraph (3) by striking "the elderly" and inserting "older individuals",

(4) in section 203—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "purposes" each place it appears and inserting "objectives", and

(B) in subsection (b) by striking "purposes" the second place it appears and inserting "objectives",

(5) in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of section 204(d), as amended by section 144(2), by striking "Americans" and inserting "individuals",

(6) in section 205(a)—

(A) by striking "purposes" and inserting "objectives", and

(B) by striking "to:" and inserting "to—",

(7) in section 207(a)(4) by striking "the greatest economic or social needs" and inserting "greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need",

(8) the last sentence of section 211 is amended by striking "purposes" and inserting "objectives",

(9) in section 301(a)(3) by striking "the vulnerable elderly" and inserting "vulnerable older individuals",

(10) in section 304(a)(1)—

(A) by striking "aged 60 or older" each place it appears, and inserting "of older individuals", and

(B) in the last sentence by striking "clause" and inserting "subparagraph",

(11) in section 305—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (C) by striking "purposes" and inserting "objectives",

(II) in subparagraph (D) by striking "the elderly" each place it appears and inserting "older individuals",

(III) in subparagraph (E) by striking "individuals aged 60 and older" and inserting "older individuals", and

(IV) in subparagraph (E) by striking "Indians" and inserting "individuals who are Indians", and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph",

(II) in subparagraph (D) by striking "subclause" and inserting "subparagraph", and

(III) in subparagraph (E) by striking "the greatest economic or social needs" and inserting "greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need",

(B) in paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of subsection (b) by striking "clause" each place it appears and inserting "paragraph", and

(C) in subsection (d) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph",

(12) in section 306—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking "Indians" and inserting "individuals who are Indians",

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B) by striking "elderly" and inserting "older individuals who are", and

(iii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking "the greatest economic or social needs" and inserting "greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need", and

(II) in subparagraph (B) by striking "rural elderly" and inserting "older individuals residing in rural areas", and

(iv) in paragraph (6)—

(I) in subparagraph (D) by striking "the elderly" each place it appears and inserting "older individuals",

(II) in subparagraph (G) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph",

(III) in subparagraph (N) by striking "Indians" the first place it appears and inserting "individuals who are Indians", and

(IV) in subparagraph (N) by striking "elder Indians in such area and shall inform such older Indians" and inserting "such individuals in such area and shall inform such individuals", and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by inserting "on aging" after "area agency" the first place it appears, and

(II) by striking "clause" each place it appears and inserting "paragraph", and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(D) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph",

(13) in section 307—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (8) by striking "the greatest economic or social needs" and inserting "greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need",

(ii) in paragraph (12)(K) by striking "subparagraph (G)(iv)" and inserting "subparagraph (H)(iv)",

(iii) in paragraph (13)—

(I) in subparagraph (A) by striking "individuals aged 60 or older" and inserting "older individuals",

(II) in subparagraph (A) by striking "the elderly" and inserting "older individuals",

(III) in subparagraph (B) by striking "subclause" and inserting "subparagraph", and

(IV) in subparagraph (I) by striking "elderly participants" and inserting "participating older individuals",

(iv) in paragraph (14)(D) by striking "clause" and inserting "subparagraph", and

(v) in paragraph (16)(B) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph", and

(B) in subsection (b)(2) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph",

(14) in paragraphs (3)(B)(iii) and (4) of section 308(b) by striking "purposes" each place it appears and inserting "objectives",

(15) in section 321(a)—

(A) in paragraph (4) by striking "elderly" and inserting "older",

(B) in paragraph (14) by striking "the older poor" and inserting "low-income older individuals", and

(C) in paragraph (15) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph",

(16) in the first sentence of section 351 by striking "purpose" and inserting "objectives",

(17) in section 402(b) by striking "Alcohol" and inserting "the Alcohol",

(18) in section 412(b) by striking "purposes" and inserting "objectives",

(19) in section 421(a) by striking "purposes" and inserting "objectives",

(20) in section 422—

(A) in the second sentence of subsection (a)(1) by striking "the rural elderly" and inserting "older individuals residing in rural areas",

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking "elderly" and inserting "older individuals who are",

(ii) in paragraph (2) by striking "the elderly" and inserting "older individuals",

(iii) in paragraph (6) by striking "the rural elderly" and inserting "older individuals residing in rural areas",

(iv) in paragraph (8) by striking "the rural elderly" and inserting "older individuals residing in rural areas",

(v) in paragraph (9)(A) by striking "intergenerational" and inserting "multigenerational", and

(vi) in paragraph (9)(B) by striking "elderly" and inserting "older individuals who are",

(21) in section 602 by striking "older Indians, older Alaskan Natives, and older Native Hawaiians" and inserting "older individuals who are Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Native Hawaiians",

(22) in section 611(a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting "individuals who are" after "older", and

(B) in paragraph (9) by striking "Indian elderly population" and inserting "population of older individuals who are Indians",

(23) in section 613 by inserting "individuals who are" after "older", and

(24) in section 614(a)—

(A) in paragraph (7) by striking "Indians aged 60 and older" and inserting "older individuals who are Indians",

(B) in paragraph (8) by striking "clause" and inserting "paragraph", and

(C) in paragraphs (1), (6), (8), and (10) by inserting "individuals who are" after "older" each place it appears.

(b) Section 502(b)(1) of the Older Americans Community Service Employment Act (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C) by striking "1954" and inserting "1986", and

(2) in subparagraph (J) by striking "persons" each place it appears and inserting "individuals".

TITLE II—1993 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGING

SEC. 201. 1993 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGING.

(a) NAME OF CONFERENCE.—The heading of title II of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—1993 NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGING"

(b) FINDINGS.—Section 201(a) of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "51,400,000 in 1986" and inserting "52,923,000 in 1990", and

(B) by striking "101,700,000" and inserting "103,646,000",

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "every 6" and inserting "every 8", and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) the out-of-pocket costs to older individuals for health care increased from 12.3 percent in 1977 to 18.2 percent in 1988,".

SEC. 202. CONFERENCE REQUIRED.

Section 202 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "The President may call a White House Con-

ference on Aging in 1991" and inserting "In 1993 the President shall convene the 1993 National Conference on Aging".

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Policy Committee", and

(3) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) by inserting "by the Policy Committee" after "selected", and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"Delegates shall include individuals who are professionals and nonprofessionals, as well as minority individuals and individuals from low-income families."

SEC. 203. CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION.

Section 203 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "as guided by the Policy Committee," after "Secretary" the first place it appears,

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively, and

(C) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

"(1) provide written notice to all members of the Policy Committee and to all staff assigned under section 204(a)(2)(D) of each meeting, hearing, or working session of the Policy Committee not later than 48 hours before the occurrence of such meeting, hearing, or working session," and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "Secretary's responsibilities and functions under this section, assure" and inserting "the recommendations of the Policy Committee, ensure",

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3),

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) publish in the Federal Register an agenda for the Conference not later than 30 days after such agenda is approved by the Policy Committee," and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively.

SEC. 204. POLICY COMMITTEE; RELATED COMMITTEES.

Section 204 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. POLICY COMMITTEE; RELATED COMMITTEES."

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "(b) OTHER COMMITTEES—" and inserting "(2)",

(3) in subsection (a) by striking "(a) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall" and inserting "(b) ADVISORY AND OTHER COMMITTEES.—(1) The Secretary may",

(4) by inserting before subsection (b), as so redesignated, the following:

"(a) POLICY COMMITTEE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Policy Committee comprised of 30 members to be selected, not later than 90 days after the enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991, as follows:

"(A) Fifteen members shall be selected by the President and shall include—

"(i) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Commissioner on Aging, a representative of the National Institute of Aging, and representatives of other Federal agencies as may be appropriate, and

"(ii) not fewer than 7 members who are representatives of public aging agencies, community based organizations specializing in aging issues, and minority aging organizations.

"(B) Six members shall be selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and shall include members of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Select Committee on Aging. Not more than 4 members selected under this paragraph may be of the same political party.

"(C) Six members shall be selected by the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, and shall include members of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the Committee on Finance, and the Special Committee on Aging. Not more than 4 members selected under this paragraph may be of the same political party.

"(D) Three members shall be selected jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leaders of the House and Senate, and shall include representatives of public aging agencies, community-based organizations specializing in aging issues, and minority aging organizations. Not more than 2 members selected under this paragraph may be associated or affiliated with one particular political party.

"(2) DUTIES OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE.—The Policy Committee shall initially meet at the call of the Secretary, but not later than 30 days after the last member is selected under subsection (a). Subsequent meetings of the Policy Committee shall be held at the call of the chairperson. Through meetings, hearings, and working sessions, the Policy Committee shall—

"(A) provide all necessary guidance and advice to the Secretary to facilitate the timely convening of the Conference,

"(B) formulate and approve an agenda for the Conference not later than 60 days after the first meeting of the Policy Committee,

"(C) make recommendations for participants and delegates of the Conference,

"(D) assign staff to participate in and monitor the activities of the committees established under subsection (b), and

"(E) formulate and approve the final report of the conference in accordance with section 205.

"(3) QUORUM; COMMITTEE VOTING; CHAIRPERSON.—(A) Twenty members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting the business of the Policy Committee.

"(B) The Policy Committee shall act by the vote of the majority of the members present.

"(C) The Policy Committee shall select a chairperson from among its members. The chairperson may vote only to break a tie vote of the other members of the Policy Committee," and

(5) in the first sentence of subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "Each such committee" and inserting "Each committee established under subsection (b)", and

(B) by inserting "and individuals who are Native Americans" before the period at the end.

SEC. 205. REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE.

Section 205 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Policy Committee",

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Policy Committee", and

(B) by inserting "and approve" after "prepare", and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the heading of such subsection by striking "SECRETARY" and inserting "POLICY COMMITTEE", and

(B) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Policy Committee".

SEC. 206. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 to carry out this title.

"(2) Authority to enter into contracts under this title shall be effective only to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

"(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), funds appropriated to carry out this title shall remain available for obligation or expenditure until January 1, 1995, or the expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date the Conference adjourns, whichever occurs earlier.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), any such funds neither expended nor obligated before January 1, 1995, or the expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date the Conference adjourns, whichever occurs earlier, shall be available to carry out the Older Americans Act of 1965.

"(3) If the Conference is not convened before January 1, 1994, such funds neither expended nor obligated before such date shall be available to carry out the Older Americans Act of 1965."

SEC. 207. SAVINGS PROVISION.

All personnel assigned or engaged under section 202(b) or section 203(a)(5), of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to be assigned or engaged under such section after such date notwithstanding the amendments made by this title.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Native American Programs Act Amendments of 1991".

SEC. 302. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION FOR NATIVE AMERICANS.

The Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991a-2992d) is amended by inserting after section 802 the following:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF ADMINISTRATION FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

"Sec. 802A. (a) There is established in the Office of the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services an Administration for Native Americans (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administration'). The Administration shall be headed by a Commissioner for Native American Programs (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Commissioner') who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administration shall be the agency responsible for carrying out this title. The Administration shall be under the direct authority and supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families, and the Commissioner shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary on all matters relating to this title, including policy, budget, and administration of programs. In the performance of the functions of the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall be di-

rectly responsible to the Assistant Secretary.

"(b) In all personnel actions of the Administration, preference shall be given to individuals who are eligible for assistance under this title. Such preference shall be implemented in the same fashion as the preference given to veterans referred to in section 2108(3)(C) of title 5, United States Code. The Secretary shall take such additional action as may be necessary to promote recruitment of such individuals for employment in the Administration.

"(c) The number of full-time positions (or equivalent thereof), and the grades of such positions, in the Administration for Native Americans shall be not less than the number of full-time positions (or equivalent thereof), and the grades of such positions, in the Administration for Native Americans as of June 30, 1986.

"(d) The Administration shall—

"(1) give preference to individuals who are eligible for assistance under this title, in entering into contracts for technical assistance, training, and evaluation under this title; and

"(2) encourage agencies that carry out projects under this title, to give preference to such individuals in hiring and entering into contracts to carry out such projects.

"INTRADEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

"SEC. 802B. The Secretary shall establish an intradepartmental council on Indian affairs to review and comment on all policies and practices of agencies in the Department of Health and Human Resources, relating to programs affecting Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Native Hawaiians. The Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans shall be the chairperson of such council and shall advise the Secretary on all matters affecting Indians that involve such Department. The Director of the Indian Health Service shall be the vice chairperson of such council."

SEC. 303. LOAN FUND; DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 803A of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking "5-year",

(B) in paragraph (2) by inserting before the period at the end the following:

"and a requirement that the grantee contribute to the revolving loan fund an amount of non-Federal funds equal to the amount of such grant";

(2) in subsection (b) by striking paragraph (6),

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) There is authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 to carry out this section.", and

(B) by striking paragraph (3), and

(4) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g)(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the agency or organization to which grants are awarded under subsection (a)(1), shall submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate, not later than January 1 following the end of each fiscal year, regarding the administration of this section in such fiscal year.

"(2) Such report shall include the views and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the revolving loan fund established under subsection (a)(1) and with respect to loans made from such fund, shall—

"(A) describe the effectiveness of the operation of such fund in improving the economic and social self-sufficiency of Native Hawaiians;

"(B) specify the number of loans made in such fiscal year;

"(C) specify the number of loans outstanding as of the end of such fiscal year; and

"(D) specify the number of borrowers who fall in such fiscal year to repay loans in accordance with the agreements under which such loans are required to be repaid."

SEC. 304. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

Section 804 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991c) is amended—

(1) by striking "may" and inserting "shall", and

(2) by inserting "planning," after "agencies in".

SEC. 305. EVALUATION.

Section 811(a) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) The project assisted under this title shall be evaluated in accordance with this section not less frequently than at 3-year intervals."

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "There" and inserting "(1) Subject to paragraph (2), there",

(B) by striking "sections 803(d) and" and inserting "section",

(C) by striking "years 1988, 1989, 1990, and" and inserting "year",

(D) by inserting before the period at the end ", \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995", and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) If for any fiscal year—

"(A) the amount appropriated under subsection (d) is less than \$8,000,000; and

"(B) the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) exceeds 105 percent of the amount appropriated under such paragraph for the preceding fiscal year;

then there shall be available to carry out section 803(d) the maximum amount of the excess described in subparagraph (B) which when added to the amount appropriated under subsection (d) does not exceed \$8,000,000.", and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), there are" and inserting "There is",

(ii) by striking "1988, 1989, 1990, and", and

(iii) by inserting ", 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995" after "1991", and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.

Any authority to enter into contracts under any amendment made by this Act shall be effective only to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATES; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1991.

(b) SPECIAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by sections 134 and 173(1) shall take effect on October 1, 1992.

(c) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendment made by section 114(1) shall not apply with respect to appointments made under section 204 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3015) before the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MARTINEZ

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I offer several amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MARTINEZ: In the table of contents, insert the following after the item relating to section 142, as so redesignated (and redesignate succeeding items accordingly):

Sec. 143. In-home services for frail older individuals.

In the table of contents, strike the items relating to title II and the heading relating to the amendments to the Native American Programs Act of 1974, and insert the following:

TITLE II—1993 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Sec. 201. 1993 White House Conference on Aging.

Sec. 202. Conference required.

Sec. 203. Conference administration.

Sec. 204. Policy committee; related committees.

Sec. 205. Report of the conference.

Sec. 206. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974

In paragraph (25) of section 202(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as added by section 112(6) of the bill, strike "and" at the end.

In paragraph (26) of section 202(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as added by section 112(6) of the bill, strike "(26)" and insert "(27)".

After paragraph (25) of section 202(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as added by section 112(6) of the bill, insert the following:

"(26) encourage, and provide technical assistance to, States and area agencies on aging to carry out outreach to inform older individuals with greatest economic need who may be eligible to receive, but are not receiving, supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act (or assistance under a State plan program under such title, medical assistance under title XIX of such Act, and benefits under the Food Stamp Act of 1977, of the requirements for eligibility to receive such benefits and such assistance; and

In section 207(c)(5) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as added by section 117(b)(3), insert "low-income" after "including" the last place it appears.

In section 131(3)—

(1) strike the close quotation marks and the period at the end, and

(2) add at the end the following:

"(14) The term 'art therapy' means the use of art and artistic processes specifically se-

lected and administered by an art therapist, to accomplish the restoration, maintenance, or improvement of the mental, emotional, or social functioning of an older individual.

"(15) The term 'dance-movement therapy' means the psychotherapeutic use of movement as a process facilitated by a dance-movement therapist, to further the emotional, cognitive, or physical integration of an older individual.

"(16) The term 'music therapy' means the use of music interventions specifically selected by a music therapist, to accomplish the restoration, maintenance, or improvement of the social or emotional functioning, mental processing, or physical health of an older individual."

In section 132(b)(1), strike "\$435,000,000" and insert "\$505,000,000".

In section 134, strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

"(C) in consultation with area agencies on aging, in accordance with guidelines issued by the Commissioner, and using the best available data, develop and publish for review and comment a formula for distribution within the State of funds received under this title that takes into account—

"(i) the geographical distribution of older individuals in the State; and

"(ii) the distribution among planning and service areas of older individuals with greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need, with particular attention to low-income minority older individuals;"

In section 135(3)(B)—

(1) in clause (i) strike "and" at the end,

(2) redesignate clause (ii) as clause (iii), and

(3) insert after clause (i) the following:

(ii) by inserting "older individuals who are of limited English-speaking ability," after "minority individuals," and

In section 306(a)(15) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as added by 135(7), strike "and" at the end.

In section 135(7)—

(1) strike the first period, the close quotation marks, and the period at the end, and insert "; and", and

(2) add at the end the following:

"(17) in the discretion of the area agency, provide for an area volunteer services coordinator, who shall—

"(A) encourage, and enlist the services of local volunteer groups to provide assistance and services appropriate to the unique needs of the elderly within the planning and service area;

"(B) encourage, organize, and promote the use of older individuals as volunteers to local communities within the area; and

"(C) promote the recognition of the contribution made by volunteers to programs administered under the area plan."

In section 136(a)(13), strike the close quotation marks and the period at the end.

At the end of section 136(a)(13), add the following:

"(40) The plan shall provide that the State agency shall designate a State entity that shall carry out the programs and activities under this title that relate to the prevention and treatment of the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals."

"(41)(A) If 50 percent or more of the area plans in the State provide for an area volunteer services coordinator, as described in section 306(a)(17), the State plan shall provide for a State volunteer services coordinator, who shall—

"(i) encourage area agencies on aging to provide for area volunteer services coordinators;

"(ii) coordinate the volunteer services offered between the various area agencies on aging;

"(iii) encourage, organize, and promote the use of older individuals as volunteers to the State;

"(iv) provide technical assistance, which may include training, to area volunteer services coordinators; and

"(v) promote the recognition of the contribution made by volunteers to the program administered under the State plan.

"(B) If fewer than 50 percent of the area plans in the State provide for an area volunteer services coordinator, the State plan may provide for the State volunteer services coordinator in subparagraph (A)."

In section 136, strike subsection (d) and redesignate subsection (e) as subsection (d).

In section 137(2), strike subparagraph (A) and insert the following:

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting "(A)" after "(4)",

(ii) by inserting "and except as provided in subparagraph (B)" after "this title",

(iii) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking "received under section 303(b) (1) and (2), a" and inserting "received by a State and attributable to funds appropriated under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 303(b), the", and

(II) by striking "a portion of the funds appropriated" and inserting "not more than 30 percent of such funds", and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) If a State demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, that funds available under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 303(b), including funds transferred under subparagraph (A) without regard to this subparagraph, for fiscal year 1993, 1994, or 1995 are insufficient to satisfy the need for services under subpart 1 or subpart 2 of part C, then the Commissioner may grant a waiver that permits the State to transfer under subparagraph (A) to satisfy such need—

"(i) an additional 18 percent of the funds so received for fiscal year 1992;

"(ii) an additional 15 percent of the funds so received for each of the fiscal years 1993 and 1994; and

"(iii) an additional 10 percent of the funds so received for fiscal year 1995."

In section 140—

"(1) redesignate paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and

"(2) in paragraph (3)—

"(A) at the end of subparagraph (A) strike "and", and

"(B) insert after subparagraph (B) the following:

"(C) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following:

"and, and to provide to older individuals who provide uncompensated care to their adult children with disabilities counseling to assist such older individuals with permanency planning for such children".

(4) in paragraph (11) by inserting before the semicolon the following:

"and, and of older individuals who provide uncompensated care to their adult children with disabilities", and

In section 363 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as added by section 142(c) of the bill, as so redesignated—

(1) in paragraph (10) strike "and" at the end,

(2) in paragraph (11) strike the first period, the close quotation marks, and the period at the end, and insert a semicolon, and

(3) insert after paragraph (11) the following:

"(12) gerontological counseling; and

"(13) music therapy, art therapy, and dance-movement therapy."

In section 143, strike paragraph (2) and insert the following:

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking "conferences," and

(ii) by striking "and" at the end,

(B) in subparagraph (D) by inserting "and" at the end, and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) strengthening and carrying out activities to prevent and treat the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of older individuals."

In section 143, insert the following after paragraph (1) and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

(2) by inserting "through the State entity designated in accordance with section 307(a)(40)" after "out" the second place it appears,

After section 133, insert the following (and conform the table of contents, and redesignate references and succeeding sections, accordingly):

SEC. 134. OUTREACH DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) USE OF ALLOTTED FUNDS.—Section 304(d)(1)(C) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3014(d)(1)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) after September 30, 1991, such amount (excluding any amount attributable to funds appropriated under section 303(a)(3)) as the State agency determines to be adequate, but not to exceed 4 percent of the amount appropriated under section 303(a)(1), for conducting effective demonstration projects under section 307(f)(1); and"

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Section 307(f) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3027(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "1986" and inserting "1991",

(B) by striking "shall" and inserting "may",

(C) by inserting after "education" the following:

"or outreach to older individuals with greatest economic need with respect to benefits available under title XVI of the Social Security Act (or assistance under a State plan program under such title), medical assistance available under title XIX of such Act, and benefits available under the Food Stamp Act of 1977," and

(D) by striking "based" and all that follows through "704(d)(2)",

(2) by amending paragraph (2)(E) to read as follows:

"(E) be evaluated by the State agency, and the results of such evaluation, and such interim reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require, shall be submitted to the Commissioner before October 1, 1993," and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) Each outreach project carried out under paragraph (1) shall—

"(A) provide to older individuals with greatest economic need information and assistance regarding their eligibility to receive benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act (or assistance under a State plan program under such title), medical assistance under title XIX of such Act, and benefits under the Food Stamp Act of 1977;

"(B) be carried out in a planning and service area that has a high proportion of older individuals with greatest economic need, relative to the aggregate number of older individuals in such area; and

"(C) be coordinated with State and local entities that administer benefits under such titles."

After section 141, as so redesignated, insert the following (and conform the table of contents, and redesignate references and succeeding sections, accordingly):

SEC. 142. NUTRITION SERVICES.

(a) CONGREGATE NUTRITION SERVICES.—Section 331(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030e(1)) is amended by inserting "(except in a rural area where such frequency is not feasible (as defined by the Commissioner by rule) and a lesser frequency is approved by the State agency)" after "week".

(b) HOME-DELIVERED NUTRITION SERVICES.—Section 336 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030f) is amended by inserting "(except in a rural area where such frequency is not feasible (as defined by the Commissioner by rule) and a lesser frequency is approved by the State agency)" after "week".

SEC. 143. IN-HOME SERVICES FOR FRAIL OLDER INDIVIDUALS.

Section 341(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030h(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2)(A) The Commissioner shall require that home health aide services provided under such program be provided only by an individual who is employed as a home health aide by an entity that is—

"(i) a home health agency, as defined in section 1861(o) of the Social Security Act, that satisfies the conditions specified in section 1891(a) of such Act;

"(ii) licensed under State law that requires training, testing, and supervision substantially equivalent to the training, testing, and supervision then required under section 1891(a) of the Social Security Act; or

"(iii) accredited by an agency approved by the Secretary.

"(B) The Commissioner shall require entities that provide home health aide services under such program to promote the rights of each older individual who receives such services. Such rights include the following:

"(i) The right—

"(I) to be fully informed in advance about each home health aide service provided by such entity under such program and about any change in such service that may affect the well-being of such individual; and

"(II) to participate in planning and changing a home health aide service provided under such program by such entity unless such individual is judicially adjudged incompetent.

"(ii) The right to voice a grievance with respect to such service that is or fails to be so provided, without discrimination or reprisal as a result of voicing such grievance.

"(iii) The right to confidentiality of records relating to such individual.

"(iv) The right to have the property of such individual treated with respect.

"(v) The right to be fully informed (orally and in writing), in advance of receiving a home health aide service under such program, of such individual's rights and obligations under this title."

In section 168—

(1) insert "(a) PERMANENCY PLANNING.—" before "Section";

(2) strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking "preventive health education and promotion programs" and inserting "disease prevention and health promotion programs (including

coordinated multidisciplinary research projects on the aging process)", and

(2) add at the end the following:

(b) MANDATORY MODEL VOLUNTEER SERVICE CREDIT PROJECTS.—Section 422 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3035a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e)(1) The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the State agency in each State involved, make not fewer than 3 and not more than 5 grants in each fiscal year to public agencies or nonprofit private organizations or enter into contracts with agencies or organizations in such State, for paying part or all of the cost of developing or operating nationwide, statewide, regional, metropolitan area, county, city, or community model volunteer service credit projects that will demonstrate methods to improve or expand supportive services or nutrition services or otherwise promote the well-being of older individuals.

(2) Such projects shall be operated in consultation with the ACTION Agency and shall permit elderly volunteers to earn for services furnished, credits that may be redeemed later for similar volunteer services."

In section 502(d)(3) of the Older Americans Community Service Employment Act, as added by section 181(4) of the bill, strike "coordinate" and all that follows through "such agency", and insert "conduct such project in consultation, to the maximum extent practicable, with such agency".

Strike title II and insert the following:

TITLE II—1993 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

SEC. 201. 1993 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING.

(a) NAME OF CONFERENCE.—The heading of title II of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—1993 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING"

(b) FINDINGS.—Section 201(a) of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "51,400,000 in 1986" and inserting "52,923,000 in 1990"; and

(B) by striking "101,700,000" and inserting "103,646,000".

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "every 6" and inserting "every 8"; and

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) the out-of-pocket costs to older individuals for health care increased from 12.3 percent in 1977 to 18.2 percent in 1988."

SEC. 202. CONFERENCE REQUIRED.

Section 202 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "The President may call a White House Conference on Aging in 1991" and inserting "In 1993 the President shall convene the 1993 White House Conference on Aging"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2) by adding at the end the following:

"Delegates shall include individuals who are professionals and nonprofessionals, as well as minority individuals and individuals from low-income families."

SEC. 203. CONFERENCE ADMINISTRATION.

Section 203 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "prepare and"; and

(ii) by inserting "prepared by the Policy Committee" after "agenda";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

"(1) provide written notice to all members of the Policy Committee of each meeting, hearing, or working session of the Policy Committee not later than 48 hours before the occurrence of such meeting, hearing, or working session."

(2) in subsection (b)—

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) the agenda prepared under subsection (a)(3) for the Conference is published in the Federal Register not later than 30 days after such agenda is approved by the Policy Committee (The Secretary may republish such agenda together with the Secretary's recommendations regarding such agenda)."; and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) GIFTS.—The Secretary may accept, on behalf of the United States, gifts (in cash or in kind) which shall be available to carry out this title. Gifts of cash shall be available in addition to amounts appropriated to carry out this title."

SEC. 204. POLICY COMMITTEE; RELATED COMMITTEES.

Section 204 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. POLICY COMMITTEE; RELATED COMMITTEES."

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "(b) OTHER COMMITTEES.—" and inserting "(2)";

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "(a) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary" and inserting "(b) ADVISORY AND OTHER COMMITTEES.—(1) The President"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"The President shall consider for appointment to the advisory committee individuals recommended by the Policy Committee."

(4) by inserting before subsection (b), as so redesignated, the following:

"(a) POLICY COMMITTEE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Policy Committee comprised of 25 members to be selected, not later than 90 days after the enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991, as follows:

"(A) Thirteen members shall be selected by the President and shall include—

"(i) 3 members who are officers or employees of the United States; and

"(ii) 10 members who are representatives of public aging agencies, community-based organizations with experience in the field of aging, and minority aging organizations.

"(B) Four members shall be selected by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and shall include members of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Select Committee on Aging. Not more than 3 members selected under this paragraph may be of the same political party.

"(C) Four members shall be selected by the majority leader of the Senate, after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, and shall include members of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources,

the Committee on Finance, and the Special Committee on Aging. Not more than 3 members selected under this paragraph may be of the same political party.

"(D) Four members shall be selected jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leaders of the House and Senate, and shall include representatives of public aging agencies, community-based organizations with experience in the field of aging, and minority aging organizations. Not more than 2 members selected under this paragraph may be associated or affiliated with one particular political party.

"(2) DUTIES OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE.—The Policy Committee shall initially meet at the call of the Secretary, but not later than 30 days after the last member is selected under subsection (a). Subsequent meetings of the Policy Committee shall be held at the call of the chairperson. Through meetings, hearings, and working sessions, the Policy Committee shall—

"(A) make recommendations to the Secretary to facilitate the timely convening of the Conference,

"(B) formulate and approve an agenda for the Conference not later than 60 days after the first meeting of the Policy Committee,

"(C) make recommendations for participants and delegates of the Conference,

"(D) establish the number of delegates to be selected under section 202(b)(2), and

"(E) formulate and approve the initial report of the Conference in accordance with section 205.

"(3) QUORUM; COMMITTEE VOTING; CHAIRPERSON.—(A) Thirteen members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting the business of the Policy Committee, except that 17 members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of approving the agenda required by paragraph (2)(B) and the report required by paragraph (2)(E).

"(B) The Policy Committee shall act by the vote of the majority of the members present.

"(C) The President shall select a chairperson from among its members. The chairperson may vote only to break a tie vote of the other members of the Policy Committee," and

(5) in the first sentence of subsection (c)—
(A) by striking "Each such committee" and inserting "Each committee established under subsection (b)", and

(B) by inserting ", and individuals who are Native Americans" before the period at the end.

SEC. 205. REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE.

Section 205 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "The Policy Committee",

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "(1) The Policy Committee",

(B) by inserting "and approve" after "prepare", and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Not later than 60 days after such final report is approved by the Policy Committee, the Secretary shall publish such final report in the Federal Register. The Secretary may republish such final report together with such additional views and recommendations the Secretary considers to be appropriate.", and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the heading of such subsection by striking "SECRETARY" and inserting "POLICY COMMITTEE", and

(B) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Policy Committee".

SEC. 206. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 to carry out this title.

"(2) Authority to enter into contracts under this title shall be effective only to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

"(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), funds appropriated to carry out this title and funds received as gifts under section 203(c) shall remain available for obligation or expenditure until January 1, 1995, or the expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date the Conference adjourns, whichever occurs earlier.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), any such funds neither expended nor obligated before January 1, 1995, or the expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date the Conference adjourns, whichever occurs earlier, shall be available to carry out the Older Americans Act of 1965.

"(3) If the Conference is not convened before January 1, 1994, such funds neither expended nor obligated before such date shall be available to carry out the Older Americans Act of 1965."

SEC. 207. SAVINGS PROVISION.

All personnel assigned or engaged under section 202(b) or section 203(a)(5), of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note) as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to be assigned or engaged under such section after such date notwithstanding the amendments made by this title.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I offer en bloc amendments today which add improvements to the services and administration of the Older Americans Act.

The amendments would change the Conference on Aging to allow for the first time joint participation by Congress and private sector groups in the setting of the national aging policy agenda for the next 10 years.

They also change the committee past formula targeting provisions to reflect the administration's targeting language in response to minority groups' concerns.

It increases the congregate meals authorization level an additional 5 percent from 1991. And they permit additional transfers between meals programs in the States beyond a 30 percent cap, with the permission of the Commissioner.

They permit States to keep elder abuse funds at the State level to target treatment and services for elder abuse.

They permit States to use title III funds to reach out to assist older individuals to receive entitlement services.

They permit rural service providers to serve fewer than five meals per week, with the permission of the State.

They also provide a number of first time services in permanency planning, volunteer service credit demonstra-

tions, State volunteer service coordinators, and target limited English individuals for supportive service outreach.

These amendments are all supported by Members on both sides of the aisle, and I urge Members to support the en bloc amendments.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTINEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I rise to say that since we were part of en bloc amendments, we have no objection.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, as the ranking member of the Aging Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2967, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991. This is an exemplary piece of legislation and deserves the support of every Member of the House. I am particularly pleased that legislation I authored is about to be incorporated in to H.R. 2967.

The portion of the bill I authored requires the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging to establish and carry out a volunteer service credit program. The service credit program allows seniors to provide volunteer services within their communities, accumulate credits for the services, and cash in the credits in order to receive the services of another volunteer when needed.

Madam Chairman, the service credit program has been carried out in six demonstration sites under a now expired Robert Wood Johnson Foundation grant. Some of these programs, and others which have developed throughout the country, now face funding difficulties which put the programs in jeopardy and force employees to spend much of their time seeking financing rather than concentrating on expanding and enhancing the program itself.

The cost of the program is relatively small; average yearly administrative costs are \$66,000, startup costs are approximately \$3,000. This legislation will require the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging to award grants to program sponsors in a variety of settings. The Federal Government will then have the capacity to evaluate each program and assess the program's adequacy in responding to the needs of senior citizens, filling existing gaps in service delivery, and offsetting the need for other costly long-term services.

According to an assessment by the Center for Health Policy Studies, Madam Chairman, the volunteer service credit program has been successful in providing essential services for the frail elderly, attracting new volunteers into the volunteer network, and instilling a positive sense of community among program participants.

The most obvious benefit of the volunteer service credit program is the service it provides to frail elderly individuals who want to remain living independently at home. The typical individual receiving services under the program is over age 76, living alone, and experiencing significant health problems. The variety of services made available by this program,

such as escort services, housekeeping, shopping, respite care, and meal preparation, make it possible for seniors to delay or avoid institutionalization in a nursing home.

Another important aspect of the program, Madam Chairman, is the mental health services it offers. Senior citizens frequently identify loneliness and a sense of uselessness as one of the most difficult aspects of older age. Service credit programs help subdue these feelings by offering "companionship visits." Companionship visits have the dual purpose of providing homebound individuals with healthy interpersonal contact and also give volunteers a renewed sense of worth.

Additionally, service credit programs have been successful in drawing new volunteers into the volunteer network. This is a very valuable aspect of the service credit program considering the huge untapped volunteer potential of our senior population. A nationwide study commissioned by Marriott Senior Living Services and the Administration on Aging, found that 37 percent of the Nation's 37.7 million senior citizens indicated they would be interested in providing volunteer services. Over one-half of volunteers in the service credit demonstration programs are new volunteers and had not volunteered in the previous year.

As health care costs climb and funding for supportive services is increasingly competitive, it is essential that Congress look to creative, cost-savings methods to deliver services to those in need. The service credit program provides essential services and, through the use of accumulated credits, also guarantees volunteers that they are eligible to receive services when needed.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2967 also contains a variety of other very important provisions which are necessary in addressing the needs of older Americans. In response to the growing incidence of elder abuse, H.R. 2967 establishes a National Center on Elder Abuse to assist States in establishing and implementing prevention and treatment programs. Also created in this legislation is the National Ombudsman Resource Center. This center will conduct research and training regarding long term care and serve as the national center on ombudsman programs.

The centers will be administered by the new Federal Long Term Care Ombudsman within the Administration on Aging who will also be responsible for coordinating State and Federal ombudsman programs and ensuring that Federal laws protecting the elderly are enforced. The Federal Ombudsman will be given powerful tools—such as the authority to subpoena and examine witnesses—in order to enforce compliance.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2967 also provides for supportive and nutrition services to millions of senior citizens. Through a system of State grants, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991 ensures the availability of congregate and home delivered meals, transportation, and in-home services for senior citizens. A new program under the bill will provide training, counseling, and assistance for individuals caring for the frail elderly.

In an effort to ensure that the service programs are reaching senior citizens most in need, H.R. 2967 also requires the formulation and implementation of improved data collec-

tion techniques to ascertain exactly who is using the program and whether or not their needs are being met. Emphasis will also be placed on targeting services for minority and low-income senior citizens.

Madam Chairman, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991 further addresses the needs of senior citizens by providing authorization for research and demonstration programs. The programs range from educational grants for students entering aging-related careers to counseling for senior citizens regarding pension rights. Additionally, the bill includes programs to demonstrate ways to prevent housing foreclosure and eviction of the aged, and encourage multigenerational activities for seniors and children.

Madam Chairman, senior citizens deserve to maintain an independent and fulfilling life style and we need to help ensure that this is possible. H.R. 2967 addresses many of the obstacles that prevent seniors from maintaining this independence. I support the bill and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2967.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

The amendments were agreed to.

□ 1440

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTERT

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTERT: At the end of title II insert the following (and conform the table of contents):

SEC. 207. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the 1993 White House Conference on Aging should consider the impact of the earnings test in effect under section 203 of the Social Security Act on older individuals who are employed.

Mr. HASTERT (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1991.

Madam Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], for his work in this endeavor in bringing forth really a very, very fine piece of legislation, and also our ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] of the subcommittee.

Madam Chairman, my amendment ensures that the concerns of working order Americans will not be forgotten among the many issues that will be addressed by the 1993 White House Conference on Aging.

As most of you know, I have been working for several years to lift the

penalty placed on senior citizens who continue to work after they reach retirement age and earn more than \$9,720 annually.

The earnings test penalizes seniors who choose to work—or must work—after they reach age 65 by taking away \$1 in social security benefits for every \$3 they earn over the \$9,720 limit. When coupled with regular taxes, this means a senior earning a paltry \$10,000 a year faces an effective marginal tax rate of 56 percent—nearly twice the tax rate of millionaires. Clearly, that is just not fair.

I am sure that most of you have heard stories from your constituents about the harmful effects of the earnings penalty. On a daily basis I receive letters from working seniors who need to work to pay their health care bills, property taxes, and daily living expenses, and yet, they find that by trying to remain independent, the government penalizes them.

While the earnings test is an example of age discrimination, there is another reason why the White House Conference should examine this penalty. Repealing the Social Security earnings limit will help our country compete in the international marketplace by keeping skilled workers in the workforce. By the end of the 1990's there will be 1.5 million fewer workers between 16 and 24 years of age who will enter the work force, but at the same time, 5 million older Americans will be retiring. It is obvious we need to remove government disincentives that prevent older workers from being productive, if they so choose.

The numbers tell us that a majority agrees; 262 Members of the House are cosponsors of my bill to repeal the earnings penalty. And the grass roots support building around the country—from citizens groups to the editorial boards of major metropolitan newspapers—demonstrates that this is something the American people want.

I wish I could be here on the floor today asking for repeal of this penalty on working seniors. But today, I am merely asking that we vote to keep this issue on the public policy agenda.

By voting for the Hastert amendment, Members of Congress will demonstrate that they believe it is important that seniors remain in the work force. Congress has the obligation, both to our Nation's older workers and to our economic vibrancy, to ensure that the White House Conference address this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTERT was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOSS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Chairman, today we are giving the older Americans of this country the consideration they deserve. However, I am struck by the irony of providing Federal moneys to fund nutritional services and job creation programs, meant to enable and empower the older persons of America, while we continue to cap their earning potential. Where is the rationale for subtracting \$1 for every \$3 senior citizens age 65 to 69 earn after \$9,720? The earnings test itself is 50 years old and ready for retirement. If, by 1993 and the convening of the White House Conference on Aging, the Social Security earnings test has not been repealed, it must be a major consideration during discussions concerning the older work force. Of course, I trust that by 1993, piecemeal liberalization will not have proven sufficient and Congress will finally heed the older Americans around the country clamoring for relief. Our economy will not recover sufficiently without the experience and perseverance of the seasoned employee. We owe them the freedom to work without penalty.

Mr. RHODES. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and thank him very much for bringing this important amendment to the floor at this time.

Like the gentleman and like many of our colleagues, I wish that we were in a position to deal substantively with this, and when I say like many of our colleagues, I mean like the 264 additional colleagues who have cosponsored the legislation which would repeal this outmoded, outdated, unneeded and egregious, unfair penalty on those of our productive senior citizens who want, need, and desire to continue to produce and to continue to contribute to our society.

I eagerly await the day when we can bring to the floor this provision, our bill, and act on it in a substantive manner, but in the meantime, I think it is extremely appropriate that we express, again, the sense of Congress that the Conference on Aging in 1993 should likewise consider the impact of this penalty on the elderly in this country.

I commend the gentleman for his work on this issue and for bringing this amendment, and likewise I urge our colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Chairman, I also commend the gentleman from Arizona for his unyielding work in this area.

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my colleague, for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] expressing the sense of Congress that the Conference on Aging should consider the impact of the Social Security earnings test on our Nation's seniors.

Eliminating the earnings test in Social Security benefits would, in my opinion, encourage older workers to remain in the work force, allow businesses both large and small to retain experienced and competent workers and reduce the Federal budget deficit.

Retaining experienced and competent older workers already is a priority in labor-intensive companies, and it will be even more critical as we face the new world economy that we face tomorrow.

Most important of all, we must be fair to our senior citizens. We should not, and we must not, penalize them for wanting to work. This is crazy.

America was built on self-sufficiency and the work ethic. We should not, by government edict, stop those who are willing to work to support themselves. This obsolete practice which began in the 1930's is one of the worst forms of discriminatory practices we have in America today.

It is time that we make things right, and this amendment and this bill will give us the opportunity to do it.

In response to those who would claim that repeal of the earnings penalty will hinder our economy, I submit that such a move will, in fact, significantly boost our current economic situation. Any increase in Social Security benefit payments will be more than offset by the increase in Federal revenues generated from the new taxable income of these very important elderly workers.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. EWING. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EWING. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the sense-of-the-Congress amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, Congressman HASTERT, concerning the Social Security earnings limitation test. I commend Mr. HASTERT for his steadfast commitment to this issue and his consistent support of older Americans.

Madam Chairman, the Social Security earnings limitation test is unfair to America's senior citizens and discriminates against those who wish to continue working during their golden years. Why should Social Security benefits be denied to those who continue to make a modest income after retirement? Social Security beneficiaries have contributed to the program and deserve an honest return on their investment, without strings attached.

The Federal Government should be adopting policies which encourage Americans to contribute to the economic system. The Social Security earnings limit test discourages those who want to play a productive role from doing so. Senior citizens should be allowed to earn an income without Government penalties.

Again, I strongly support Mr. HASTERT's amendment and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

□ 1450

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTERT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the ranking Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I merely want to compliment the gentleman for offering this sense-of-Congress resolution, and the efforts we would make on its behalf would certainly be very meaningful, I think, to our economy and to our senior citizens.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. Being an original cosponsor of H.R. 2967, I simply say that I agree with what the gentleman is saying. Certainly we have no problem with this amendment and we accept it.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Chairman, I have long been concerned about the Social Security earnings test and the way in which it penalizes older individuals who remain in the work force. I believe that removing the earnings limit altogether will not only protect older individuals from having their Social Security benefits reduced because they continue to work, but will also benefit our Nation, which is becoming increasingly dependent on the talented and skills of older workers. As our population continues to age, I believe it is essential to look to our Nation's older citizens as an increasingly important segment of the labor force. I firmly believe that older workers should be encouraged to remain in the work force, without being unfairly penalized.

Currently, individuals between the ages of 65 and 70 who earn more than \$9,360 have their benefits reduced \$1 for every \$3 earned above that amount. To correct this discrimination, Representative HASTERT has introduced H.R. 967, the Older Americans Freedom to Work Act of 1991, of which I am an original cosponsor. This bill is designed to eliminate the Social Security earnings limit altogether. In fact, 259 of my colleagues have joined as cosponsors in support of this bill.

However, the amendment which Mr. HASTERT has offered today is not about repealing the earnings test. It is not about raising the benefits to our working seniors. His amendment simply asks that we commit ourselves to investigating the Social Security earnings test's impact on hundreds of thou-

sands of our Nation's senior citizens. How can we say no to an opportunity for increased understanding and knowledge?

I share Mr. HASTERT's concern that the issue of the Social Security earnings test has not yet been properly addressed. I applaud his initiative to learn more about this critical issue. In fact, I cannot think of a more appropriate place to study this issue than the 1993 White House Conference on Aging, nor a more appropriate place to offer this amendment than in the Older Americans Act, an act committed to serving the social and economic needs of our Nation's senior citizens.

I hope that you will join me in support of this amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation now before us, the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act and the amendment offered by Mr. HASTERT which would express the sense of the Congress that the upcoming conference on aging should consider the impact of the Social Security earnings test. Year after year the Older Americans Act has proven to be one of the most effective and acclaimed programs funded by the Congress. It is the primary vehicle for the organization and delivery of social services to elderly Americans. The act establishes programs which try to improve the lives of seniors in respect to income, health, housing, long-term care, and transportation. These programs provide important nutritional services, create job opportunities for low-income seniors, fund training and research in the field of aging, and many other services which benefit older Americans. As I have traveled throughout the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin, I have come in contact with several seniors who benefit directly from the programs operated through this act. Without these programs numerous, elderly individuals, especially those who reside in rural areas, would have to travel great distances and go through several difficulties in order to receive the assistance they require. Regarding the amendment offered today by Mr. HASTERT, the earnings limit is something that the Congress needs to look at very closely. I am cosponsoring the legislation introduced by Mr. HASTERT which would repeal this earnings limitation and allow seniors to work past retirement without losing their Social Security benefits. The Conference on Aging would be an excellent forum to discuss the impact of repealing this Social Security earnings limit, which unfairly penalizes seniors for wanting to become independent of Government assistance. There are many talented older Americans who want to work and share their job skills, but under the present earnings limitation law, they are essentially forced out of the labor market because they lose \$1 of their benefits for every \$3 they earn above \$9,720. This is bad public policy. This penalty, in addition to other taxes employees pay, represents an effective taxation rate of nearly 60 percent for older Americans. With rising health care and other costs, many seniors depend on outside income to meet their needs. The Government should not be in the practice of overly taxing older Americans who are attempting to be financially independent.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment offered by Mr. HASTERT in addition

to the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of Representative HASTERT's amendment to the Older Americans Act. This amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the 1993 White House Conference on Aging should consider the impact of the Social Security earnings test on older individuals who are employed.

I would like to commend Mr. Hastert for introducing this important amendment.

As you may know, in addition to cosponsoring Mr. HASTERT's measure, H.R. 9867, the Older American Freedom to Work Act, I have introduced legislation to fully repeal the Social Security earnings test. My Bill, H.R. 102, eliminates the earnings test for Social Security beneficiaries over the age of 65, as well as raises the new cap on outside earnings for those Social Security beneficiaries between the ages of 62 and 65.

Under current law, Social Security beneficiaries under the age of 70 who are employed or self-employed received their full benefits unless their earnings exceed the annual earnings limitation.

Currently senior citizens over the age of 65 lose \$1 for every \$3 which they earn over the income cap. While this is an improvement over the previous 1:2 reduction—a reduction that those seniors under the age of 65 are still subject to—the reduction translates into a draconian tax rate of 33 percent for our Nation's seniors. A tax rate that is not affordable by most seniors.

Take for example a senior over the age 65 earning a modest amount just over the earnings cap is subject to the earnings test 33 percent marginal tax. When the income and Social Security taxes that seniors pay are added, the total tax bill can reach 60 percent of a senior's earnings.

The Social Security earnings test originated with the creation of the Social Security System in 1935. One purpose was to remove older workers from the labor force in order to create jobs for the young. However, in today's labor situation, seniors are able to meet the increasing demand for service-oriented workers, and most importantly, they enjoy working. By allowing seniors to return to the work force, they provide many benefits to our Nation, such as increased tax revenues, as well as alleviating the depression and loneliness that often accompanies the later years in an individual's life.

Senior citizens make up approximately 34.9 million of the population, and this number is growing steadily. Our Nation's seniors are skilled, knowledgeable, reliable, and eager to work.

Madam Chairman, Mr. HASTERT's Amendment to H.R. 2967 is a step in the right direction. I urge all my colleagues to take this opportunity to help our Nation's seniors by expressing their support and voting in favor of this amendment.

Mr. RINALDO. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by Mr. HASTERT of Illinois to express the sense of Congress that the 1993 White House Conference on Aging consider the impact of the Social Security earnings test on older workers.

As a proponent of earnings test reform, I firmly believe that no person should be dis-

couraged from striving to remain a productive part of our labor force, particularly on the basis of his age.

The earnings test helps no one. From the business community, I hear that we need mature, experienced workers to keep our Nation competitive; yet the earnings test keeps these workers out of the work place. And from older workers, I understand that financial pressures make part time, and even full time, employment a necessary supplement to Social Security benefits. Making ends meet is a struggle for many seniors, but the earnings test means a loss in Social Security benefits for even modest earned income.

The earnings test does not apply to income from investments and pensions, but it does deny Social Security benefits to millions of Americans who have not had the luxury of saving for retirement. This is clearly not fair to those older individuals who must work to keep up with increases in the cost of rent, food, and health insurance.

Previous White House Conferences on Aging have been responsible for the enactment of the Medicare Program and the Older Americans' Act. These are significant accomplishments which have improved the quality of life for older Americans.

I believe that repeal of this limit will also be a significant improvement in the lives of many of our Nation's elderly, and I am confident that expressing the sense of the Congress on this issue will certainly be an important first step toward the elimination of the earnings test.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Hastert amendment. I have worked to eliminate the earnings test since I came to Congress, and I hope that this initiative will place added weight to this effort.

I have been in touch with the Social Security Administration. They tell me that among men 62 to 69, 5.1 percent who file for Social Security have their benefits reduced. This means 276,200 people. Among women, the figure is 2.4 percent or 103,810 people. The information I get from my ex-employer, Corning, Inc., tells me that many retirees return to work part time. They want to work, they are experienced, valuable contributors, but they often must quit well before their assignment is completed. Why? They have reached their earnings limit.

Madam Chairman, by changing the earnings limitation we will be able to reduce, forever, a substantial cost associated with the Social Security Program. And it will permit us to harness the usable, the useful, and the unused pool of the best talent of all—dedicated and experienced seniors. I may be missing something, but I feel it would be that simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair announces that she will reduce to a

minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 255]

Abercrombie	Dixon	Johnson (CT)
Ackerman	Donnelly	Johnson (SD)
Alexander	Dooley	Johnson (TX)
Allard	Dorgan (ND)	Johnston
Anderson	Dornan (CA)	Jones (GA)
Andrews (ME)	Downey	Jontz
Andrews (NJ)	Duncan	Kanjorski
Andrews (TX)	Durbin	Kaptur
Annunzio	Dwyer	Kasich
Anthony	Dymally	Kennedy
Applegate	Early	Kennelly
Armey	Eckart	Kildee
Aspin	Edwards (CA)	Kleczka
Atkins	Edwards (OK)	Klug
AuCoin	Edwards (TX)	Kolbe
Bacchus	Emerson	Kopetski
Baker	Engel	Kostmayer
Ballenger	English	Kyl
Barnard	Erdreich	LaFalce
Barrett	Espy	Lagomarsino
Barton	Evans	Lancaster
Bateman	Ewing	Lantos
Beilenson	Fascell	LaRocco
Bennett	Fawell	Leach
Bentley	Feighan	Lent
Bereuter	Fields	Levin (MI)
Bevill	Fish	Lewis (FL)
Bilbray	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Bilirakis	Foglietta	Lightfoot
Billey	Ford (MI)	Lipinski
Boehlert	Ford (TN)	Livingston
Boehner	Frost	Lloyd
Bonior	Gallo	Long
Borski	Gaydos	Lowey (NY)
Boucher	Gejdenson	Luken
Boxer	Gekas	Machtley
Brewster	Geren	Manton
Brooks	Gilchrest	Markey
Broomfield	Gillmor	Martin
Browder	Gilman	Martinez
Brown	Gingrich	Matsui
Bruce	Glickman	Mavroules
Bryant	Gonzalez	Mazzoli
Bunning	Goodling	McCandless
Burton	Gordon	McCloskey
Bustamante	Goss	McCollum
Byron	Gradison	McCrery
Callahan	Grandy	McCurdy
Camp	Green	McDade
Campbell (CA)	Guarini	McDermott
Campbell (CO)	Gunderson	McEwen
Cardin	Hall (OH)	McGrath
Carper	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Carr	Hamilton	McMillan (NC)
Chandler	Hammerschmidt	McMillen (MD)
Chapman	Hancock	McNulty
Clay	Hansen	Meyers
Clement	Harris	Michel
Clinger	Hastert	Miller (OH)
Coble	Hayes (IL)	Miller (WA)
Coleman (MO)	Hefley	Mineta
Coleman (TX)	Hefner	Mink
Collins (IL)	Henry	Moakley
Collins (MI)	Hertel	Molinari
Combest	Hoagland	Mollohan
Condit	Hobson	Montgomery
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	Moody
Costello	Horn	Moorhead
Cox (CA)	Horton	Moran
Cox (IL)	Houghton	Morella
Coyne	Hoyer	Morrison
Cramer	Hubbard	Mrazek
Cunningham	Huckaby	Myers
Darden	Hughes	Natcher
de la Garza	Hutto	Neal (MA)
DeFazio	Hyde	Neal (NC)
DeLauro	Inhofe	Nichols
DeLay	Jacobs	Nowak
Dellums	James	Nussle
Derrick	Jefferson	Oakar
Dickinson	Jenkins	Oberstar

Obey	Roth
Olin	Roukema
Oliver	Rowland
Ortiz	Roybal
Orton	Russo
Owens (UT)	Sabo
Oxley	Sangmeister
Packard	Santorum
Pallone	Sarpalius
Panetta	Savage
Parker	Sawyer
Patterson	Saxton
Paxon	Schaefer
Payne (VA)	Schiff
Pease	Schroeder
Pelosi	Schulze
Penny	Schumer
Perkins	Sensenbrenner
Peterson (FL)	Sharp
Peterson (MN)	Shaw
Petri	Shays
Pickett	Shuster
Porter	Sikorski
Poshard	Sisisky
Price	Skaggs
Pursell	Skeen
Rahall	Skelton
Ramstad	Slaughter (NY)
Ravenel	Slaughter (VA)
Reed	Smith (FL)
Regula	Smith (IA)
Rhodes	Smith (NJ)
Richardson	Smith (OR)
Ridge	Smith (TX)
Rinaldo	Snowe
Ritter	Solarz
Roberts	Solomon
Roe	Spence
Roemer	Spratt
Rogers	Staggers
Rohrabacher	Stallings
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Rose	Stenholm
Rostenkowski	Stokes

Studds	Darden
Stump	de la Garza
Sundquist	DeFazio
Swett	DeLauro
Swift	DeLay
Synar	Dellums
Tallan	Derrick
Tanner	Dickinson
Tauzin	Dingell
Taylor (MS)	Dixon
Taylor (NC)	Donnelly
Thomas (GA)	Dooley
Thomas (WY)	Dorgan (ND)
Thornton	Dornan (CA)
Torres	Downey
Trafficant	Duncan
Traxler	Durbin
Unsoeld	Dwyer
Upton	Dymally
Valentine	Early
Vander Jagt	Eckart
Visclosky	Edwards (CA)
Volkmer	Edwards (OK)
Vucanovich	Edwards (TX)
Walker	Emerson
Walsh	Engel
Waxman	English
Weber	Erdreich
Weiss	Espy
Weldon	Evans
Wheat	Ewing
Whitten	Fawell
Williams	Feighan
Wilson	Fields
Wise	Fish
Wolf	Flake
Wolpe	Foglietta
Wyden	Ford (MI)
Wyllie	Ford (TN)
Yates	Frank (MA)
Young (AK)	Franks (CT)
Young (FL)	Frost
Zeliff	Gallo
Zimmer	Gaydos

□ 1515

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred seventy-five Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 0, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—383

Abercrombie	Bentley	Campbell (CA)
Ackerman	Bereuter	Campbell (CO)
Alexander	Bevill	Cardin
Allard	Bilbray	Carper
Anderson	Bilirakis	Carr
Andrews (ME)	Bliley	Chandler
Andrews (NJ)	Boehlert	Chapman
Andrews (TX)	Boehner	Clay
Annunzio	Bonior	Clement
Anthony	Borski	Clinger
Applegate	Boucher	Coble
Archer	Boxer	Coleman (MO)
Armey	Brewster	Coleman (TX)
Aspin	Brooks	Collins (IL)
Atkins	Broomfield	Collins (MI)
AuCoin	Browder	Combest
Bacchus	Brown	Condit
Baker	Bruce	Conyers
Ballenger	Bryant	Cooper
Barnard	Bunning	Costello
Barrett	Burton	Cox (CA)
Barton	Bustamante	Cox (IL)
Bateman	Byron	Coyne
Beilenson	Callahan	Cramer
Bennett	Camp	Cunningham
		Jontz
		Kanjorski
		Kaptur
		Kasich
		Kennedy
		Kennelly
		Kildee
		Kleczka
		Klug
		Kolbe
		Kopetski
		Kostmayer
		Kyl
		LaFalce
		Lagomarsino
		Lancaster
		Lantos
		LaRocco
		Leach
		Levin (MI)
		Lewis (FL)
		Lewis (GA)
		Lightfoot
		Lipinski
		Livingston
		Lloyd
		Long
		Lowey (NY)
		Luken
		Machtley
		Manton
		Markey
		Martin
		Martinez
		Matsui
		Mavroules
		Mazzoli
		McCandless
		McCloskey
		McCollum
		McCrery
		McCurdy
		McDade
		McDermott
		McEwen
		McGrath
		McHugh
		McMillan (NC)
		McMillen (MD)
		McNulty
		Meyers
		Michel
		Miller (CA)
		Miller (OH)
		Miller (WA)
		Mineta
		Mink
		Moakley
		Molinari
		Mollohan
		Montgomery
		Moody
		Moorhead
		Moran
		Morella
		Morrison
		Myers
		Nagle
		Natcher
		Neal (NC)
		Nichols
		Nowak
		Nussle
		Oakar
		Oberstar
		Obey
		Olin
		Oliver
		Ortiz
		Orton
		Owens (UT)
		Oxley
		Packard
		Pallone
		Panetta
		Parker
		Patterson
		Paxon
		Payne (VA)
		Pease
		Pelosi
		Penny
		Perkins
		Peterson (FL)
		Peterson (MN)
		Petri
		Pickett
		Poshard
		Price
		Pursell
		Rahall
		Ramstad
		Ravenel
		Reed
		Regula
		Rhodes
		Rohrabacher
		Ros-Lehtinen
		Rose
		Rostenkowski
		Roybal
		Russo
		Sabo
		Sanders
		Sangmeister
		Santorum
		Sarpalius
		Savage
		Sawyer
		Saxton
		Schaefer
		Scheuer
		Schiff
		Schroeder
		Schulze
		Schumer
		Sensenbrenner
		Sharp
		Shaw
		Shays
		Shuster
		Sikorski
		Sisisky
		Skaggs
		Skeen
		Skelton
		Slattery
		Slaughter (NY)
		Slaughter (VA)
		Smith (FL)
		Smith (IA)
		Smith (NJ)
		Smith (OR)
		Smith (TX)
		Snowe
		Solarz
		Solomon
		Spratt
		Staggers
		Stallings
		Stearns
		Stenholm
		Stokes
		Studds
		Stump
		Sundquist
		Swett
		Swift
		Synar
		Tallan
		Tanner
		Tauzin
		Taylor (MS)
		Taylor (NC)
		Thomas (GA)
		Thomas (WY)
		Thornton
		Torres
		Torricelli
		Trafficant
		Traxler
		Unsoeld
		Upton
		Valentine
		Vander Jagt
		Vento
		Visclosky
		Volkmer
		Vucanovich
		Walker

Walsh	Whitten	Wylie
Washington	Williams	Yates
Waxman	Wilson	Young (AK)
Weber	Wise	Young (FL)
Weiss	Wolf	Zeliff
Weldon	Wolpe	Zimmer
Wheat	Wyden	

NOES—0
NOT VOTING—49

Berman	Hopkins	Murtha
Coughlin	Hunter	Neal (MA)
Crane	Ireland	Owens (NY)
Dannemeyer	Jenkins	Payne (NJ)
Davis	Jones (NC)	Pickle
Dicks	Kolter	Quillen
Doolittle	Laughlin	Rangel
Dreier	Lehman (CA)	Ray
Fascell	Lehman (FL)	Serrano
Fazio	Lent	Spence
Gallegly	Levine (CA)	Stark
Gephardt	Lewis (CA)	Thomas (CA)
Gibbons	Lowery (CA)	Towns
Hatcher	Marlenee	Waters
Hayes (LA)	Mfume	Yatron
Herger	Mrazek	
Holloway	Murphy	

□ 1523

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT
Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Traficant: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that a recipient (including a nation, individual, group, or organization) of any form of grant or other Federal assistance under this Act should, in expending that assistance, purchase American-made equipment and products.

SEC. NOTICE.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide procedures to inform such recipients of the Sense of the Congress under the above section.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, this is a modest amendment. It is a sense-of-Congress amendment providing that any form of grants or other Federal assistance under this act be used to purchase American-made goods and products. I think it is nothing more than a reminder. It is probably not needed, like in some instances, because our seniors usually buy American. But it is a reminder that Congress should be sending out.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment, and we accept the amendment on this side.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the vice-chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, we are happy to accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) having assumed the chair, Mrs. PATTERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2967) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; to authorize a 1993 National Conference on Aging; to amend the Native Americans Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1995; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 219, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 385, noes 0, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—385

Abercrombie	Annunzio	Bacchus
Ackerman	Anthony	Baker
Alexander	Applegate	Ballenger
Allard	Archer	Barnard
Anderson	Armer	Barrett
Andrews (ME)	Aspin	Barton
Andrews (NJ)	Atkins	Bateman
Andrews (TX)	AuCoin	Beilenson
Bennett	Bentley	Bereuter
Bevil	Bilbray	Bilirakis
Bliley	Boehlert	Boehner
Bonior	Borski	Boucher
Boxer	Brewster	Brooks
Broomfield	Browder	Brown
Bryant	Bunning	Burton
Bustamante	Byron	Callahan
Camp	Campbell (CA)	Campbell (CO)
Cardin	Carper	Carr
Chandler	Chapman	Clay
Clement	Clinger	Coble
Coleman (MO)	Coleman (TX)	Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)	Combest	Conyers
Cooper	Costello	Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)	Coyne	Cramer
Cunningham	Darden	de la Garza
DeFazio	DeLauro	DeLay
Dellums	Derrick	Dickinson
Dingell	Dixon	Donnelly
Dooley	Dorgan (ND)	Dornan (CA)
Downey	Duncan	Durbin
Dwyer	Early	Eckart
Edwards (CA)	Edwards (OK)	Edwards (TX)
Emerson	Engel	English
Erdreich	Espy	Evans
Ewing	Fascell	Fawell
Feighan	Fields	Fish
Flake	Foglietta	Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)	Frank (MA)	Franks (CT)
Frost	Gallo	Gaydos
Gejdenson	Gekas	Geren
Gilchrest	Gillmor	Gilman
Gingrich	Glickman	Gonzalez
Goodling	Gordon	Goss
Gradison	Grandy	Green
Guarini	Gunderson	Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)	Hamilton	Hammerschmidt
Hancock	Hansen	Harris
Hastert	Hayes (IL)	Hefley
Hefner	Henry	Hertel
Hoagland	Hobson	Hochbrueckner
Horton	Houghton	Hoyer
Hubbard	Huckaby	Hughes
Hutto	Hyde	Inhofe
Jacobs	James	Jefferson
Jenkins	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (TX)
Johnston	Jones (GA)	Jontz
Kanjorski	Kasich	Kennedy
Kennelly	Kildee	Kleczka
Klug	Kolbe	Kopetski
Kostmayer	Kyl	LaFalce
Lagomarsino	Lancaster	Lantos
LaRocco	Leach	Lent
Lewis (MI)	Lewis (FL)	Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot	Livingston	Lloyd
Long	Lowey (NY)	Luken
Machtle	Manton	Martin
Martinez	Matsui	Mavroules
Mazzoli	McCandless	McCloskey
McCollum	McCrery	McCurdy
McDade	McDermott	McEwen
McGrath	McHugh	McMillan (NC)
McMillan (MD)	McNulty	Meyers
Michel	Miller (CA)	Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)	Mineta	Mink
Moakley	Molinar	Mollohan
Montgomery	Moody	Moorhead
Moran	Morella	Morrison
Mrazek	Myers	Nagle
Natcher	Neal (NC)	Nichols
Nowak	Nussle	Oakar
Oberstar	Obe	Olin
Owens (NY)	Owens (UT)	Oxley
Packard	Pallone	Panetta
Parker	Patterson	Paxon
Payne (VA)	Pease	Pelosi
Penny	Perkins	Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Petri	Pickett
Porter	Poshard	Price
Pursell	Rahall	Ramstad
Rangel	Ravenel	Reed
Regula	Rhodes	Richardson
Ridge	Riggs	Rinaldo
Ritter	Roberts	Roe
Roemer	Rogers	Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen	Rose	Rostenkowski
Roth	Roukema	Rowland
Roybal	Russo	Sabo
Sanders	Sangmeister	Santorum
Sarpalio	Savage	Sawyer
Saxton	Schaefer	Scheuer
Schiff	Schroeder	Schulze
Schumer	Sensenbrenner	Sharp
Shaw		

Shays	Studds	Vucanovich
Shuster	Stump	Walker
Sikorski	Sundquist	Walsh
Siskisky	Swett	Washington
Skaggs	Swift	Waters
Skeen	Synar	Waxman
Skelton	Tallon	Weber
Slattery	Tanner	Weiss
Slaughter (NY)	Tauzin	Weldon
Slaughter (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Wheat
Smith (FL)	Taylor (NC)	Whitten
Smith (IA)	Thomas (GA)	Williams
Smith (NJ)	Thomas (WY)	Wilson
Smith (OR)	Thornton	Wise
Smith (TX)	Torres	Wolf
Snowe	Torricelli	Wolpe
Solarz	Trafficant	Wyden
Solomon	Traxler	Wylie
Spence	Unsoeld	Yates
Spratt	Upton	Young (AK)
Staggers	Valentine	Young (FL)
Stallings	Vander Jagt	Zeliff
Stearns	Vento	Zimmer
Stenholm	Visclosky	
Stokes	Volkmer	

NOT VOTING—47

Berman	Herger	Markey
Condit	Holloway	Marlenee
Coughlin	Hopkins	Mfume
Crane	Hunter	Murphy
Dannemeyer	Ireland	Murtha
Davis	Johnson (CT)	Neal (MA)
Dicks	Jones (NC)	Payne (NJ)
Doollittle	Kaptur	Pickle
Dreier	Kolter	Quillen
Dymally	Laughlin	Ray
Fazio	Lehman (CA)	Serrano
Galleghy	Lehman (FL)	Stark
Gephardt	Levine (CA)	Thomas (CA)
Gibbons	Lewis (CA)	Towns
Hatcher	Lipinski	Yatron
Hayes (LA)	Lowery (CA)	

□ 1553

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at a meeting with my constituents elsewhere in the Capitol during the vote on final passage of the Older Americans Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that, due to important business in my district, I was unable to participate in the votes on the Older American Act reauthorization. Had I been here, I would have supported both the Hastert amendment on the Social Security earnings test and the bill itself on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be here to vote on rollcalls numbered 254, 256, and 257. Rollcall vote 255 was a quorum call.

If I had been present I would have voted "no" to rollcall No. 254, "yes" to rollcall No. 256, and "yes" to rollcall No. 257.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2967, OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2967, the Clerk be authorized to make corrections in section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the action of the House in amending H.R. 2967, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2967, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1991, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3090

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce have until 6 p.m. on Friday, September 13, 1991, to file its report to accompany H.R. 3090.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from New York has no objection and consents to this request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2508, INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION ACT OF 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2508) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to

authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. BROOMFIELD

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROOMFIELD moves that the managers on the part of the House of Representatives at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2508 be instructed to insist on maintaining the position of the House with respect to the provisions of Title IV of the House bill, related to International Narcotics Control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we support the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion to instruct conferees to insist on the House position in title IV of H.R. 2508, the International Cooperation Act of 1991.

Title IV of H.R. 2508 is a comprehensive rewrite of the international narcotics control provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. While I wish the Congress could have engaged in a long overdue rewrite of the entire foreign aid process, it was not possible this year. The House did, however, rewrite and streamline the provisions of law concerning international narcotics control.

In a bipartisan effort, the task force on international narcotics control of the Committee on Foreign Affairs spent many days consolidating and updating legislation to strengthen our overseas efforts in the drug war.

While S. 1435, the Senate-passed version, was almost silent on international narcotics provisions, H.R. 2508 represents a major step forward in our ability to support international narcotics control programs, and significantly increases the administration's flexibility in such programs.

H.R. 2508 allows the administration to provide more types of narcotics-re-

lated assistance in more circumstances. H.R. 2508 authorizes the full administration request of \$171.5 million for fiscal year 1992. It completely rewrites the annual narcotics certification process and links the process directly to the landmark 1988 U.N. Convention.

The requirements for the annual international narcotics control strategy report are revised and expanded to recognize the global nature of the illicit drug trade. H.R. 2508 provides flexibility for the administration by modifying a number of restrictions in current law which have been added by Congress over the last decade.

Mr. Speaker, the House unanimously approved title IV during consideration of H.R. 2508. There is no section in the bill with stronger bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct the conferees to insist upon the House provisions.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Broomfield motion to instruct foreign aid conferees to insist on the House provisions in title IV of H.R. 2508 dealing with international narcotics control.

As one Member who has been closely involved with legislation to strengthen our overseas counternarcotics efforts for many years, I believe the bipartisan package in title IV represents a significant advance in our efforts. Our provisions on international narcotics control were the product of careful deliberations. Title IV increases the administration's flexibility while retaining congressional oversight. It revises the annual narcotics certification process and the international narcotics control strategy report to reflect the changing nature of the international drug trade.

One major advance in our legislation is to recognize the importance of the 1988 U.S. Convention—a document which has helped to truly internationalize the war on drugs. Title IV was unanimously adopted by this House and should be retained in conference.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. BROOMFIELD's motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will appoint conferees at a later time.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1415, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1415), to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of State, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will appoint conferees at a later time.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. GRAY III

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 220) to honor accomplishments and express the appreciation for a dedicated career in public service of the Honorable William H. Gray III on the occasion of his resignation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 220

Whereas William H. Gray III was elected to serve in the United States House of Representatives in 1979 as the Representative of the people of the Second Congressional District in Pennsylvania.

Whereas William H. Gray has served the people of his Congressional District with enthusiasm, distinction and compassion.

Whereas during his tenure in the House of Representatives, William H. Gray has served with noted excellence on Congressional Committees including the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on House Administration.

Whereas Mr. Gray's service as Chairman of the Committee on the Budget and as a Majority Whip was especially distinguished.

Whereas Mr. Gray's legislative acumen and personal affability have rendered him greatly admired and well regarded by his colleagues in the House of Representatives and in other circles throughout the United States and abroad.

Whereas William H. Gray's participation, presence and leadership will be missed in this legislative body.

Resolved, That it is in the sense of the House of Representatives that the outstanding legislative and personal achievements of William H. Gray III should be duly recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our beloved Member of the House of Representatives, Bill Gray, resigned on yesterday, and beyond his tenure as majority whip, we recognize his distinguished service in this House of Representatives as having served as chairman of the Committee on the Budget and as having served as chairman of the Democratic caucus, and so we would like to take this time, Mr. Speaker, just to pay tribute to a distinguished career.

There are a number of speakers, Members of the House, who asked me all day today what time we would begin this special resolution, and I am sure that they will be making their way to the floor as we move through this.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of this concurrent resolution in honor of a departing colleague who is leaving behind a legacy of service and achievement in the U.S. Congress that will inspire our Nation for many years to come.

Bill Gray is leaving behind 434 colleagues who respect his leadership and appreciate his commitment to our country. And he is leaving behind a record which will ensure his place in the history books of our Nation.

Bill Gray has mastered the art of politics. He rose to leadership in the Congress on the strength of his vision, on the basis of his ability, and because of his hard work and dedication. He moved to the top the old-fashioned way—he earned it.

Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, and from all regions of the country, know Bill as a skillful consensus molder. We know him as an expert coalition builder. We know him as an inspirational leader and an informed teacher. And most of all, we know him as an impassioned preacher.

Bill Gray has been a leading spokesman on United States policy toward Africa. He has been a leading voice for minority- and women-owned businesses, and a champion of historically black colleges and universities. He has been a voice for working and middle-income Americans, and for those Americans who have been locked out of the economic mainstream.

He has been a voice for racial justice and a passionate fighter for civil rights.

His legislative record includes authorship of the House versions of the Anti-Apartheid Acts of 1985 and 1986, sponsoring the emergency food aid bill for Ethiopia in 1984, and writing the bill which established the Africa Development Foundation in 1984.

But, despite all of his outstanding accomplishments in this body, this particular Member of Congress will re-

member Bill Gray most because he has been, and continues to be, a friend.

Five years ago, as a freshman Congressman from Mississippi, I was appointed to the House Budget Committee. Bill Gray was the chairman. He did not have to take time to personally assist a new member of the committee—but he did. He did not have to take the time to help me understand the process—but he did. He could have been aloof, but he was not.

He is leaving the Congress this week—but he is not leaving the career of public service to which he is dedicated.

At the United Negro College Fund, Bill will be using his considerable talents to help provide educational opportunities to African-American youth who otherwise would have none. He will use his leadership ability to help the UNCF be even more effective in its mission of educating the next generation of African-American leaders.

His leaving will certainly be a loss for the Congress. But knowing Bill as I do, I am sure that, in the long run, it will be a plus for African-Americans, and most of all, for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution in honor of the service of our distinguished former majority whip, Congressman Bill Gray, and I will at this time yield time to any other Member seeking to have time in honor of the life of Bill Gray in this body and in support of the resolution honoring his life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I rise in support of the resolution commending our distinguished colleague, William Gray, who ascended to the high office of whip in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in all of the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], in his congratulations and his laudatory comments with respect to our colleague.

I would simply conclude by saying that I have always cherished the friendship that I have with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAY, and I look forward to seeing him continue to rise and go forward in a bright and intelligent fashion that he exemplified as a Member of this body.

□ 1610

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in commendation of Congressman Gray, now our former colleague, who will always be remembered in our hearts very dearly.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I voice my support for this

resolution, as it marks the occasion of the moving on of my close friend and colleague, Majority Whip Bill Gray.

For 12 years our colleague has distinguished himself as statesman and friend to many of us in this Chamber. His work on the various committees on which he has served and in the leadership of this institution can only be described as stellar. It is rare, Mr. Speaker, that a member with such a level of dedication, affability and compassion comes among us; Bill Gray is one, and I am sorry to see him go.

Bill's leadership is the standard by which all of us in the Congressional Black Caucus, and indeed in the Congress, should strive to achieve. I wish him the best as president of the United Negro College Fund, as he continues his service to the future of black leadership.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and congratulate my good friend and colleague, Bill Gray, as he leaves Congress.

I rise, however, with mixed feelings. I know that Bill Gray has made his decision to leave Congress based on what is right for him and for his family. I know that Bill's work for the United Negro College Fund will follow in his family's tradition of furthering educational opportunities for black Americans. And I know that the fund will be better for having Bill Gray as its president.

But in the midst of those good feelings, I feel a sense of loss, for myself, for Philadelphia, for the Congress and for the United States.

Since I first came to Congress in 1983, Bill has provided me with guidance and advice. The wisdom of a senior colleague is a valuable commodity to a junior member, and Bill was a font of wisdom.

He has been both a friend and a confidante, an advisor on politics and policy, and a steady source of support at all times. I will miss Bill Gray.

Bill has been the informal "dean" of the Philadelphia delegation since 1981. But even before that, he was hard at work for the city and its people.

Bill's work for Philadelphia has been far-reaching. He has been pastor of Bright Hope Baptist Church since 1972, and preaches there to this day.

Bill worked to improve living conditions for Philadelphia's lower income residents as head of a nonprofit housing corporation and served on the boards of the Philadelphia Urban Coalition, the Health and Welfare Council of Philadelphia and the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. He also wrote a weekly column for the Philadelphia Tribune.

In 1978, Bill was elected to Congress, and began representing the people of the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. On the Budget Committee he pressed for increased funding for social programs, even in the face of the Reagan administration's defense buildup.

Bill Gray has fought for Philadelphia's port, transit system, and naval shipyard. He's struggled on behalf of Philadelphia's working men and women and for Philadelphia's fiscal survival.

One recent example of Bill Gray's lasting legacy for the people of Philadelphia is the

victory he won in providing a dedicated source of State funding for mass transit in Pennsylvania.

After over 2 years of struggle, legislation sponsored by Bill forced Pennsylvania to join the rest of the country in supporting transit. With Philadelphia relying on the largest transit system in the State, this was a major achievement for the city.

To say that Bill Gray is also a major player in Philadelphia politics is an understatement. His support is critical in almost any election in Philly, and his opposition is often too overpowering to be countered. I do not think it would be stretching the truth to say that, on his retirement from politics, Bill is the most influential figure on the Philadelphia political scene.

Yes, Philadelphians will miss Bill Gray.

The Congress is also losing one of its all-time brightest stars. From the very beginning of his tenure here in Washington, Bill Gray was a man to be reckoned with.

He was elected president of the 1978 freshman class, and won seats on the Budget, Foreign Affairs and Steering and Policy Committees.

By 1985, he was chairman of the Budget Committee, where he consistently built majority coalitions in support of his committee's budget resolutions. After 4 years in the Budget Committee chair, Bill Gray moved on, and up, as he was overwhelmingly elected to the chairmanship of the House Democratic caucus.

Within a year, Bill had been elected majority whip, the office he now leaves. I have no doubt, that had Bill not decided to accept the United Negro College Fund presidency, he would have been Speaker of the House by the turn of the century. The U.S. Congress will miss Bill Gray.

Finally, America is losing one of its premier statesmen. Bill Gray has become well known throughout the country as a spokesman for Congress, the Democratic Party, Philadelphia and black Americans. And, as the highest elected African-American official, Bill has been a source of pride and a role model for the black community.

We will all miss Bill Gray. I wish him, his wife Andrea and his three children all the best.

The United Negro College Fund's gain is surely our loss.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a colleague of ours who decided to leave the Congress: the Honorable William H. Gray, III of the great State of Pennsylvania.

Bill Gray has had one of the most remarkable careers in congressional history. In a mere 12 years of congressional service, Bill rose to become first the chairman of the Budget Committee and finally, the first African-American member of the House leadership when he became the majority whip in 1989.

Bill Gray took over the chairmanship of the Budget Committee in 1985 during very dark days for the Democrats. Ronald Reagan had just won the largest landslide in American history and the House had suffered through 4 years of budget turmoil. Under Gray's chairmanship, the House Democrats reversed the Reagan priorities and reestablished Democratic unity. The four budget resolutions by Bill

Gray's Budget Committee passed with a combined Democratic vote of 919-77, and ended the Republican/boll-weevil control of the Budget process.

As majority whip, the list of legislation Bill Gray helped pass in a mere 2 years is lengthy. By forging the coalitions needed to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Civil Rights Bills of 1990 and 1991, and by garnering the votes to pass the Child Care bill, the Brady Handgun bill, the Minimum Wage bill, the Ethics Reform Package of 1989, and the largest deficit reduction package in American history, Gray proved to be both a master politician and coalition builder.

Furthermore, it is a tribute to Bill Gray's character to understand why he is leaving the House at this stage of his political life. Bill is resigning to become the president of the United Negro College Fund. Bill comes from a family dedicated to education. Both his parents were college professors, and his father was President of Florida A&M University. It is fitting that he is continuing this honorable legacy by becoming the head of the organization responsible for educating 40 percent of all the African-Americans who receive college degrees.

Bill Gray truly exemplifies the word service. Both in government and now as head of the UNCF, Bill has excelled as both a leader for Americans in general and African-Americans in particular. I will miss Bill's leadership in the House, but I know that whatever cause Bill decides to champion, he will do it with the drive and the energy that he exemplified here in the House. It has been an honor to work with Bill during my years in the House, and it is an honor to call him a friend as he pursues new and greater challenges in the years to come.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of engaging the majority leader, or his representative, in a colloquy about the schedule for next week.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have been temporarily promoted to the high office of leadership.

Mr. SOLOMON. Congratulations.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. It is momentary, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will continue to yield, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of September 16, 1991, is as follows:

On Monday, September 16, the House will meet at noon. There will be one bill under Suspension, S. 296, Armed Forces Immigration Adjustment Act of 1991, followed by H.R. 3291, District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 1992, with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 3040, unemployment compensation amendments, rule and general debate only.

On Tuesday, September 17, the House will meet at 9 a.m. and will adjourn by 1 p.m. There will be the Private Calendar.

Also on the agenda for Tuesday will be a continuation of H.R. 3040, unemployment compensation amendments, to complete consideration.

The House will adjourn Tuesday at 1 p.m., as I said earlier, in observation of Yom Kippur.

On Wednesday, September 18, the House is not in session.

On Thursday, September 19, the House meets at 10 a.m. There will be no legislative business.

On Friday, September 20, the House is not in session.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman enlighten the membership as to what will happen if votes do occur on any of these three bills that will be taken up prior to general debate on the unemployment insurance bill? How might those votes be taken and at what time?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the Suspension can be moved, and as the gentleman knows, under a Suspension bill the vote can be carried over until the next day.

The problem we have with respect to H.R. 3291, the District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal year 1992, is that if a motion to recommit is offered on the floor, as the gentleman knows, under the rules of the House that motion cannot be carried over until the next day.

Similarly, with respect to H.R. 3040, the unemployment compensation amendments, if a vote occurs on the previous question, again under the rules of the House that vote cannot be carried over.

So what this gentleman is saying to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, is that we cannot on this side guarantee that there will be no votes, but as I understand from the leadership, they will endeavor to work with the minority to try to construct it in such a fashion that it minimizes any hardship on the Members.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might just inform the membership, there is in all likelihood, as a matter of fact almost guaranteed, that there will be votes on Monday. We have just completed a Rules Committee meeting on the unemployment insurance bill, H.R. 3040. To us, we think it is a very unfair rule that none of the Republican

amendments were allowed to be in order, including the Republican leadership amendment and substitute.

Therefore, there will certainly be a fight on the rule on the floor, and no doubt there will be votes.

I might just point out that if that does occur, which it probably will, if we go into session at 12 noon, it looks to me that those votes might occur sometime between 2 and 3 or 3:30 in the afternoon; so I would enlighten the membership to expect votes probably at that time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the gentleman's remarks. It seems clear to this gentleman that the votes may even occur earlier than 2 o'clock, so that all Members should be advised and admonished that on Monday they should be present in the Chamber because votes more than likely will occur.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, I thank the gentleman for clarifying this for the membership.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to ascend to the high office of the leadership momentarily.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3040, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-201) on the resolution (H. Res. 221) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3040) to provide a program of Federal supplemental compensation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, September 16, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, September 16, 1991, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, September 17, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 17, TO THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991**

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, September 17, 1991, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Thursday, September 19, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**THE 450TH ANNIVERSARY OF
JESUIT ORDER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 1991 marks the 500th anniversary of the birth of St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus. It is also the 450th anniversary of Ignatius' election as the first general of the Jesuit Order. Both these historical landmarks are worthy of note in themselves but, in a more personal way, the cause as well of reflection for those whose lives have been touched by the Jesuits.

The Jesuits have presented many faces to the world. In Charles Kingsley's epic tale of English adventure on the Spanish Main, "Westward Ho," the Jesuits filled the role of the fanatical janissaries of Roman Catholicism as seen from a 19th century Protestant point of view. They have been called the intellectual shock troops of the counter-reformation, owing loyalty directly to the Pope, and Jesuits such as Edmund Campion were martyred in their efforts to return the faith to England.

Jesuits were from the beginning missionaries, spreading the Gospel along the far reaches of western exploration—in India, China, Japan, Africa, and North and South America. Again there were martyrs—Francis Xavier, Isaac Jogues, and many others. They insisted on proselytizing in communities and cultures inherently hostile to their message and their means of delivering it, which was often advanced within a program of humanitarian service and social justice.

The Jesuits were, and remain, teachers. Their schools and universities throughout the world have been centers of scientific and intellectual advancement, particularly in philosophy and theology. From the Council of Trent to the Second Vatican Council, Jesuit theologians have played a prominent role in shaping the direction of Catholic doctrine. And Jesuit influence in the governance of certain European monarchies was once so prominent that it eventually led to the suppression of the order. It is probably from this political involvement that the term "jesuitical" came to mean given to intrigue or equivocation.

In this modern age, Jesuits are still martyrs—in El Salvador and other parts of Latin America. They are still teachers whose teaching both inspires and molds governing elites—often of radically different political persuasions. It is the quality of this teaching, its striving for the development of the whole man, however,

that is the gift its students most employ in their lives beyond the university. His secretary described Ignatius as a "contemplative in action." Those who have received a Jesuit education are taught to strive for this duality as a means of advancing both their own faith and social justice.

For many critics of the Jesuits, it is a sign of priestly or religious failure that much of their work is politically tinged in its social activism. Some are shocked by the almost adventurist nature of some Jesuit theological thought. There are in fact areas of Jesuit expression which provoke lively discussion within the order itself and among its students. Both are signs of the vitality and intellectual vigor of Jesuit teaching and proselytizing. Both are strengths as long as they reflect devotion to spiritual growth and intellectual honesty.

For the great majority of those exposed to Jesuit teaching in this country, great controversy is removed from their experience. They count an education second to none as the benefit of their Jesuit tutelage. But all are taught to understand and to be prepared to accept the moral challenges they may encounter in life. Whatever path each may choose, he or she has a stake in the continuing mission of the Jesuits. Probably the best proof of the enduring value these products of Jesuit instruction see in what they have received lies in their willingness to send their children back to the Jesuits for educating.

These varied experiences are all part of the legacy of Ignatius and his small band of followers. As a biased product of Jesuit education, I believe the order remains a vibrant and enduring force for the pursuit of man's reconciliation with God through his effort to improve the world in which God has placed him. Long may Jesuits around the world—and those they have touched—continue to pursue this goal.

□ 1620

**LEGISLATION AFFECTING FARM
PRICES AND THE CURRENT
GATT TALKS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that affects the current GATT talks, agriculture, aid prospects to the Soviet Union, our domestic food supplies and what the American consumer pays for their market basket of food. Obviously that is a pretty tall order especially when you consider the fact my legislation is simple; it merely moves the June 30, 1992 deadline for completion of an acceptable GATT agreement to January 1 of the coming year.

Why the legislation? Why move the deadline? In the first place, farm prices are at depressed levels and the outlook for U.S. agriculture exports is bleak. Things are tough in farm country and it may get tougher.

Second, everyone wants to help avert starvation in the Soviet Republics but

how are we going to provide that assistance, especially when our current grain stockpiles are declining. Not to worry, we are not running out of grain but current carryovers are coming down to reasonable levels that usually cause concern in this town. A major Soviet purchase could bring consumer lobbies out of the price control woodwork.

Third, there is concern and frustration in farm country. The good news is that ending stocks for wheat are around 600 million bushels, a level that generally translates into \$4 wheat in Dodge City, KS, and renewed prosperity and rural development. The bad news is that the surplus is at reasonable levels and there has been no price recovery, wheat is still about a dollar below last year's level. What is going on?

We are in fact at a farm program policy crossroads. Our wheat producers have lost over half of their export market share. The United States has been cast in the role of being the world's residual supplier. Our competitors for the world's wheat, grain and other commodity markets are growing in number and in their ability to produce in abundance.

It is not probable but certainly possible for this country to witness lower grain stocks at home combined with continued low farm prices, a sharp increase in food prices and demands for grain imports and a sudden realization we may be giving the Soviet people credits to purchase what we don't have.

We have provisions in the budget act to change our farm program policy if there is no progress on the GATT talks, no resolution of trade distorting subsidies; changes that will protect U.S. farmers and U.S. agriculture.

Thankfully, we have a means to get at this problem. There is a deadline for completion of an acceptable GATT agreement and it is June 30 of next year. But, why wait and endure another crop year of low prices, loss of market share and more pain and suffering throughout farm country not to mention the bizarre scenario I described previously.

My legislation would move the June 30, 1992 deadline to January 1 of the coming year. By doing so, our GATT negotiators will be able to send a clear and tough signal to the European Community that the United States will not permit any more footdragging by some of the EC member countries.

Each day, each week, each month that goes by without some resolution of the unfair trading practices adds to the economic burden we in farm country must shoulder as we struggle to feed this country, a troubled and hungry world and still make a profit.

My legislation does not change the nature of the so-called GATT-triggered trade policy tools in the reconciliation agreement. And, we do have the tools

to regain market share and improve farm income; an expanded export program, a marketing loan for wheat and feed grains and no acreage reduction programs.

The rest of the provisions include waiving the budget agreement of last year, additional funding for export programs, and marketing loans—that deadline is June 30, 1993, and under my legislation would be moved to June 30, 1992.

Now, some have accused me of advocating a trade war. Consider this, we are already in a trade war and we are losing. It is time to fight back. We can no longer afford to be the world's residual supplier. We can no longer afford to be the world's sole practitioner of supply management. The more we ask our farmers to set aside, the more our competitors increase their acreage and subsidize their farmers. We can no longer afford the foot dragging by other parties to the GATT discussions that keep a final resolution out of reach.

Mr. Speaker, I am not advocating a trade war. But, as I said before, we are in the midst of a battle and I think its time to get out of the trenches. I urge my colleagues to support the development and implementation of an aggressive trade policy that will result in either a successful trade agreement or that will enable us to recapture our markets. I welcome cosponsors and debate on this issue.

A summary of my bill follows:

SUMMARY

The Agriculture Reconciliation Act of 1990, which is contained in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, contains triggered provisions that shall or may be used in the event the USTR is unable to reach an agreement by June 30, 1992.

The statute states that if: (subsection a) such an agreement cannot be reached, the Secretary of Agriculture is:

(1) Authorized to waive any minimum level for any acreage limitation for the 93-95 crops of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton or rice. I.E., no ARP or setaside.

(2) Shall increase funding for export promotion and export programs by \$1 billion beginning October 1, 1993.

(3) Shall permit (implement) market loans for wheat and feed grains.

In addition, if a GATT agreement does not enter into force, i.e., is not implemented by June 30, 1993, then:

(1) The requirements of the 1990 budget agreement can be waived in all or part.

(2) Further increases shall be made in programs authorized under the Ag Trade Act of 1978.

(3) Again, shall implement marketing loans.

The Roberts Bill leaves this provision in place, but changes the pertinent deadlines and implementation dates.

The bill's new deadline is January 1, 1992. And, all provisions authorized to kick in starting in 1993 are changed to start in 1992.

THE OCTOBER SURPRISE TASK FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, Walter Lippman, that great American liberal, in his famous treatise entitled "public opinion," published back in 1922, wrote the following, and I quote:

That legalized atrocity, the congressional investigation, in which Congressmen, starved of their legitimate food for thought, go on a wild and feverish manhunt, and do not stop at cannibalism.

Twenty-two years later, in 1944, then Senator Harry S. Truman, said in the Senate, and I quote: "In my opinion, the power of investigation is one of the most important powers of Congress."

And he went on: "The manner in which that power is exercised will largely determine the position and prestige of the Congress in the future."

Madam Speaker, while Lippman and Truman had slightly different views on the value of congressional investigations, I think they both would agree that the reputation of the Congress can be greatly affected, for better or worse, by the manner in which investigations are conducted.

I raise this point because I am greatly disturbed by the prospect of an ad hoc task force conducting a formal investigation into allegations that are over a decade old.

I am referring, of course, to the Speaker's announcement of August 5, that he was calling on the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to form a task force to inquire into allegations that the 1980 Republican Presidential campaign was somehow involved in a delay of the release of hostages in Iran.

Madam Speaker, my concern is not so much about the subject of the inquiry, though I question just how much can be ascertained some 11 years after the fact. Instead I am more concerned about the wisdom of having an ad hoc task force conducting such a formal inquiry, and all its implications for the institution.

My major concern centers on the fact that task forces are not subject to House rules and procedures, including sunshine rules for meetings and hearings, protections for minority members, and the rights of witnesses.

All of these rules which now apply to House standing committees and subcommittees have been developed over two centuries and have served this institution well in ensuring orderly process, accountability, and openness.

But with just one stroke of the Speaker's pen in creating this so-called October surprise task force, these rules, procedures and protections have been thrown out the window. What we are left with is an animal of uncertain origin, traits or behavior being unleashed to roam freely in search of who-knows-what?

Madam Speaker, I raise this issue not because I have any question about the

intelligence, integrity or fairness of the person who has been designated chairman of the task force. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], dating back to our many years together on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I know he didn't ask for this task and was somewhat reluctant to take it given all the important current concerns of his Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. And I can't say I blame him for being apprehensive about mounting this uncertain beast he has been stuck with.

I am sure he has already been struck with many of the same questions I have about the nature of the beast:

Are we creatures of the leadership or the committee?

What authority does the task force have?

What staff will it have and how much will it cost?

How long will the inquiry last?

Will we have subpoena power and how do we get it?

Should we be subject to the same open meeting and hearing rules as other committees?

Should we give the minority the same rights to call witnesses and file views as they have on House committees?

What are our quorum requirements and how many Members are required to depose witnesses?

Will we have both domestic and foreign travel authority?

Do we file our final report with the committee, the leadership, or the House?

How do we evade the Democratic caucus rule that limits committees to not more than eight subcommittees, including task forces lasting more than 6 months?

Madam Speaker, these are just a few of the questions that are raised at the outset, before the task force has even been fully appointed or organized. Can you imagine how many more questions will arise once it begins its inquiry? Can you imagine the potential procedural and legal problems which might arise when public witnesses try to deal with this unusual entity.

Madam Speaker, I am raising these issues and questions now because I am concerned about the reputation of this institution. If we do not address them properly from the outset and ensure that the task force is operating within the same limits as other House entities, we will be opening ourselves to all manner of difficulties and even embarrassment down the road.

I strongly urge the bipartisan leadership and the Foreign Affairs Committee to sit down and iron these matters out now, before the task force sets off on its uncertain course.

Madam Speaker, I will include in the RECORD at this point a letter I have written to the Speaker on this matter. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 12, 1991.
Hon. TOM FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the Ranking Republican on the Rules Committee, I am writing to express my concern about certain procedural issues raised in connection with the creation of the so-called "October Surprise" task force which you announced back on August 5th.

Most of my concerns revolve around the fact that task forces are not subject to the same House Rules as standing committees and subcommittees. I would therefore like to propound the following questions:

(1) Is the task force to be considered a leadership or committee task force?

(2) Will the task force have subpoena authority, and if so, how will it get it?

(3) Will a time limit be placed on the inquiry, and if not, how long do you expect it to last?

(4) If the task force lasts longer than six months, how will this be reconciled with the Democratic Caucus prohibition on more than eight subcommittees, including task forces lasting longer than six months?

(5) Will the task force require additional staff, and, if so, how many and at what cost?

(6) Will the task force be subject to all the same rules as other House committees and subcommittees, and, if so, how will such authority, requirements, and procedures be extended to the task force—by the House, the Foreign Affairs Committee, or self-adopted rules?

(7) Will the minority have the same right to call witnesses and file views as it now has under House Rules for committees?

(8) Will the task force have foreign and domestic travel authority, and, if so, do you expect the task force to engage in extensive travel?

(9) Will witnesses before the task force have the same protections as they now have before committees under House Rules?

(10) Will the task force file its final report with the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Speaker, or the House?

I am sure you will agree that the sooner these questions are resolved, preferably before the task force begins its work, the greater will be the chances that the integrity of its proceedings and the reputation of the House will be protected.

With all best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,
Member of Congress.

□ 1630

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2508, INTERNATIONAL CO- OPERATION ACT OF 1991

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELLUMS). Without objection the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2508, the International Cooperation Act of 1991, and, without objection, reserves the authority to make additional appointments of conferees to specific particular portions of the House bill and Senate amendment as the subject of various appointments:

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to con-

ference: Messrs. FASCELL, HAMILTON, YATRON, SOLARZ, GEJDENSON, DYMALLY, TORRICELLI, BROOMFIELD, GILMAN, LAGOMARSINO and LEACH.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1415, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 1415, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and, without objection, reserves the authority to make additional appointments of conferees and to specify particular portions of the House bill and Senate amendment as the subject of various appointments:

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FASCELL, BERMAN, WEISS, DYMALLY, FALEOMAVAEGA, LANTOS, and BROOMFIELD, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

From the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, for consideration of sections 128, 915 and 1042 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. OAKAR, and Messrs. NEAL of North Carolina, LAFALCE, LEACH, and BREUTER.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 126, 171, and 208 of the House bill, and sections 123-25, 143-44, 711-12 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, MAZZOLI, KOPETSKI, FISH, and MCCOLLUM.

From the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for consideration of sections 118 and 121, and part D of title I of the House bill, and sections 119 and 920, and part D of title I of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CLAY, SIKORSKI, ACKERMAN, HORTON, and MYERS of Indiana.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 621, 913, 925, and 1104 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, JENKINS, ARCHER, and CRANE.

There was no objection.

CHARLIE MATERO: MAKING WESTCHESTER A BETTER PLACE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of those individuals who, through wide-ranging activities benefiting diverse parts of his community, has won the respect and admiration of the entire community. Tonight, my good friend, Char-

lie Matero, is being honored by Westchester's 52 Association for the Handicapped with its 1991 Medal of Honor. Charlie well deserves this recognition. He has been a loyal and reliable supporter of the 52 Association for many years, and through this and his other activities, he has made a real difference in the lives of his Westchester neighbors.

A Westchester County native, Charlie served our Nation with distinction during World War II. For many years, he has been a leader in the International Union of Operating Engineers, which he currently serves as business representative. He is also actively involved with professional organizations including the Westchester Private Industry Council, the Hudson Valley Labor-Management Council, and the Labor Advisory Board to Westchester County's government.

In addition to Charlie's many professional involvements, he has been an exceptional friend of such important charities as the Cerebral Palsy Foundation, the American Committee on Italian Immigration, the Boy Scouts of America, the American Diabetes Association, and the N.A.A.C.P. He was an active volunteer fireman for many years. In each of those capacities, he has served others and worked to make life better for many.

These good works have not gone unnoticed. Charlie has been honored for his humanitarian spirit and service the Westchester Community College Foundation, B'nai B'rith, United Cerebral Palsy of Westchester, Westchester County Affirmative Action Council, Boys Town of Italy, the Dr. I Foundation, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

It is my privilege to count Charlie Matero as a friend and as a trusted advisor. In working with Charlie over the years, I have seen first hand how he gets things done. His life is a fine example of the success that can be achieved by hard work, good sense and a dedication to what is right. Without fail, when the people of Westchester have needed him, Charlie Matero has been there ready to help. This latest honor is one that he richly deserves, and I am pleased to join in calling attention to all of Charlie's good works.

DRUG SUPPLY REDUCTION ACT OF 1991

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, today I join my colleague, Mr. COUGHLIN, in introducing the second part of the President's drug strategy legislation.

This bill, the Drug Supply Reduction Act of 1991 includes interdiction systems improvements, new Coast Guard authority, financial enforcement enhancements, drug testing and other law enforcement system improvements.

Along with attempts to reduce drug demand we must also attack the drug supply side. I urge my colleagues to join us in this important legislation and I am submitting for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I—INTERDICTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 101.—Short title for title I.

This section names this title of the Bill the "Order to Land Act of 1991".

Sec. 102.—Criminal penalty for failure to land.

This proposal would make it a criminal offense for intentionally failing to obey the order of an authorized Federal law enforcement officer to land an aircraft. One who violates this section shall be subject to fines under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. Aircraft used in violation of this section may be seized and shall be forfeited.

Sec. 103.—FAA revocation authority.

This section would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize revocation of an aircraft's registration certificate by operation of law upon a pilot or operator's intentional refusal to land an aircraft.

A person whose airman certificate is revoked by the Administrator may follow the appeal procedures set forth in subsection (c)(3) of Section 609 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1429(c)(3)).

Sec. 104.—Coast Guard air interdiction authority.

This amends title 14 of the United States Code to provide the Coast Guard with specific law enforcement authority with respect to aircraft flying over the high seas and waters over which the United States has jurisdiction.

Sec. 105.—Coast Guard civil penalty provisions.

This amends title 14 of the United States Code to provide the Coast Guard with a civil penalty, not to exceed \$5000, for intentional violations of proposed section 2237 of title 18, United States Code (Section 102 of this Act), involving orders issued by Coast Guard commissioned officers, warrant officers, or petty officers.

Sec. 106.—Customs orders.

This amends the enforcement provisions of Section 1581 of Title 19 so as to clarify that Customs officers may exercise their enforcement authority outside of the United States, including any location in which Customs Officers are permitted to conduct inspections, examinations or searches, including any such location in a foreign country.

Sec. 107.—Customs civil penalty provisions.

This provides the Customs Service with a civil penalty, not to exceed \$5,000, for intentional violations of proposed section 2237 of title 18, United States Code (Section 102 of this Act), involving orders issued by Customs officers.

TITLE II—NEW COAST GUARD AUTHORITIES

Sec. 201.—Short title for title B.

This section names title II the "Coast Guard Assistance Act of 1991".

Sec. 202.—Information exchange and assistance.

This section will clarify the authority of the Coast Guard to provide assistance and suggestions to the State Department on matters in which the Coast Guard may have a substantial interest. The change in new subsection (a) reflects additional missions that have been statutorily assigned to the Coast Guard since section 142 was codified in 1949. This section would broaden this authority to include the provision of assistance to the United Nations or other recognized international organizations.

Sec. 203.—Assistance to foreign governments and international organizations.

This section will clarify the authority of the President under 14 U.S.C. 149 to utilize members and facilities of the Coast Guard to assist foreign governments and international organizations.

Sec. 204.—Amendment to the Mansfield amendment to permit law enforcement operations in archipelagic waters.

Under current 22 U.S.C. 2291(c) (the Mansfield amendment), officers and employees of the United States may not directly effect arrests in any foreign country as part of a foreign police action with respect to narcotics control efforts, unless the arrest is made in the territorial sea of the country with the agreement of that country.

This amendment would permit Coast Guard operations to be conducted in the archipelagic waters of an archipelagic state as well as the territorial seas of that country, subject to the agreement of that country.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301.—Short title for title III.

This section names this title the "Financial Enforcement Act of 1991."

Sec. 302.—Anti-structuring amendment.

This technical amendment makes a change to the anti-structuring provision of the Bank Secrecy Act, 31 U.S.C. 5324, to specify that structuring transactions to avoid the \$3000 identification requirement of 31 U.S.C. 5325 is prohibited.

The proposed amendment will make it clear that customer structuring of transactions or smurfing to avoid the \$3000 identification requirement is also a violation of the Bank Secrecy Act.

Sec. 303.—FATF recommendations.

This section contains provisions necessary to bring the financial enforcement program in the United States into conformity with the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) on money laundering.

Sec. 304.—Geographic targeting amendment.

This amendment adds a provision to section 5326 prohibiting financial institutions from disclosing the existence or terms of the order to any person except as prescribed by the Secretary.

Sec. 305.—Amendments to the Right to Financial Privacy Act.

This section extends the protection of section 1103(c) of the RFPA to a financial institution that severs relations with a customer or refuses to do business because of information underlying a suspicious transaction report, and by specifying that the financial institution that acts in good faith in reporting a suspicious transaction is protected from civil liability to the customer under any theory of state or Federal law.

This amendment also broadens the protection of section 1103(c) to the wide range of bank and non-bank institutions subject to the Bank Secrecy Act, 31 U.S.C. 5312, to the extent that these institutions are required to file suspicious transaction reports. Non-bank institutions, which are required to file suspicious transaction reports, may similarly be inhibited from reporting suspicious transactions by fear of civil liability for defamation or breach of contract or under financial or consumer privacy laws.

Under this proposal, the protection from civil liability would apply to any institution enumerated in 31 U.S.C. 5312 if the Secretary has exercised his regulatory authority under proposed 31 U.S.C. 5318(g) (Section 303 of this Bill) by requiring that type of institution to file a report on suspicious transactions.)

Sec. 306.—Transfer of Records to FinCen.

Section 1112 of the RFPA, 12 U.S.A. 3412, provides that an agency that obtains financial records in accordance with the RFPA (either after customer notice or pursuant to an authorized notice exception) notify a customer if it transfers the records to another agency.

The amendment adds a new subsection 1112(g) to provide that an agency can trans-

fer records obtained in accordance with the RFPA to FinCen for criminal law enforcement purposes without customer notice. FinCen also would be able to disseminate the results of its analysis whether based in whole or in part on records obtained subject to the RFPA to the appropriate agency for criminal investigation without customer notice.

Sec. 307.—Technical amendment substituting the Secretary of Agriculture for the Secretary of the Treasury.

This amendment would give administrative responsibility for payment from the Drug Pollution Fund to the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV—DRUG TESTING

Sec. 401.—Drug testing of Federal offenders on post conviction release.

This section would create a nationwide program of drug testing for Federal offenders on post-conviction release.

Subsection (a) of section 401 adds a new section to the criminal code (proposed 18 U.S.C. 3608) requiring a drug-testing program for Federal offenders on post-conviction release.

Subsection (b) amends existing statutes to provide that defendants placed on parole, probation or post-imprisonment supervised release will be subject to a mandatory condition that they refrain from illegal use of drugs and submit to drug tests.

Subsection (c) contains amendments that make revocation of release mandatory if an offender unlawfully uses drugs or refuses to cooperate in required drug testing.

Sec. 402.—Drug testing in State criminal justice systems as a condition of receipt of justice drug grants.

This section generally conditions eligibility for federal justice assistance funding on state's adoption of drug-testing program for targeted classes of persons confined in or subject to the supervision of the state's criminal justice system.

TITLE V—OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Sec. 501.—Short title for title V.

This section names this title the "Drug Law Enforcement System Improvements Act of 1991."

Sec. 502.—Enhancement of penalties for drug trafficking in prisons.

This proposal is designed to increase the penalties for drug possession and trafficking inside Federal prisons, jails, and detention facilities, as well as for smuggling or attempts to smuggle controlled substances into such institutions.

Sec. 503.—Seizure of vehicles with concealed compartments.

This section would amend the seizure and forfeiture provisions of the Anti-Smuggling Act of 1935, 19 U.S.C. 1703, to subject trucks and private automobiles to seizure if there is a concealed compartment, whether or not there is contraband or narcotics residue.

Sec. 504.—Close loophole for illegal importation of small drug quantities.

This proposal would amend section 497 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1497, to eliminate a loophole whereby in certain situations involving failure to declare illegal importation of small quantities of drugs, the violator is subject to a very minor penalty.

Sec. 505.—Undercover operations—churn-ing.

This proposal would make permanent the authority in Section 7608(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, thus facilitating the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to plan long-term undercover operations targeted at money laundering.

Sec. 506.—Drug paraphernalia amendment. This section makes an addition to the drug paraphernalia statute (section 422 of the Controlled Substances Act) (21 U.S.C. 863). Under this law, which was originally enacted as part of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, it is illegal to use the mails to sell drug paraphernalia, to offer for sale such paraphernalia in interstate or foreign commerce, or to import or export such paraphernalia. A violation of this law is felony punishable by up to three years imprisonment and a \$100,000 fine.

The proposal would add a new subsection to the paraphernalia statute, which would create a civil penalty of up to \$100,000 for violations of the paraphernalia statute, and would authorize the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief against persons who violate the statute.

Sec. 507.—Correction of resentencing sanction for revocation of probation for possession of a controlled substance.

This section takes the view that, upon revocation of probation, the court shall impose any appropriate term of imprisonment.

Sec. 508.—Conforming amendments concerning marihuana.

This amendment makes conforming changes two sections of law creating identical penalties for domestically trafficking in or importing marihuana.

The first part of the proposed amendment would add "mixture or substance" language to the lowest penalty level provisions relating to marihuana in the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act, thus conforming these provisions to the others set forth in those statutes.

The proposed amendment would change the provision in section 960(b)(4) to 50 rather than 100 plants.

Sec. 509.—Addition of drug conspiracies and attempts and serious crack possession offenses by juveniles as warranting adult prosecution.

This amendment would add certain "crack" cocaine and drug conspiracy and attempt offenses committed by juveniles to the list of crimes set forth in 18 U.S.C. 5032 authorizing prosecution as an adult if the Attorney General certifies that there is a "substantial federal interest in the case" that justifies adult prosecution.

Sec. 510.—Serious drug offenses by juveniles as Armed Career Criminal Act predicates.

This section includes acts of juveniles delinquency that, if committed by an adult, would meet the Act's definition of a "serious drug offense," i.e., those drug felonies that carry a maximum prison term of ten years or more.

Sec. 511.—Conforming amendment adding certain drug offenses as requiring fingerprinting and records for recidivist juveniles.

This proposal makes conforming changes to 18 U.S.C. 5038(d) and (f), statutes which require a court to fingerprint and photograph a juvenile, and transmit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation records concerning juvenile adjudications, whenever a juvenile has on two separate occasions been adjudicated a delinquent for conduct that, if committed by an adult, would be a felony crime of violence or more of several listed felony drug trafficking violations.

Sec. 512.—Clarification of narcotic or other dangerous drugs under the Rico statutes.

This section substitutes a reference to offenses of dealing in "controlled substances", in order to give precise nature of the conduct prohibited.

Sec. 513.—Conforming amendments to recidivist penalty provisions of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act.

This amendment would essentially effect two conforming changes the need for which arises from the enactment of section 6452 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. Section 6452 eliminated verbose language in 21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(A) describing the types of drug offenses repeated commission of which subjects the offender to enhanced penalties (which language is identical to that in other subparagraphs of that section and to language in 21 U.S.C. 960(b)(1), (2), and (3) and 962(b)) and replaced it with the term "felony drug offenses" which was then defined, for purposes only of subparagraph (A), in the next sentence of that paragraph. Section 6452 also amended 21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(A), but not its counterpart offense in the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act, 21 U.S.C. 960 (b)(1), to provide for a so-called "three-timer loser" mandatory sentence of life imprisonment for a person who commits a violation of that offense or of sections 405, 405A or 405B (new sections 418-420) of the Controlled Substances Act after two or more convictions for a felony drug offense have become final.

Under the proposed amendment, the same definitional simplification achieved by the amendment of 21 U.S.C. 841 (b)(1)(A) by section 6452 would be extended to the other subparagraphs of that section as well as to the counterpart provisions of section 960(b) and 962(b), and the applicable definition of "felony drug offense" would be moved to a new subsection (c), where it would be applicable throughout each title.

In addition, the "three loser" amendment of 21 U.S.C. 841 (b)(1)(A) enacted by section 6452 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 would be extended as to apply to the comparable import and export offenses in 21 U.S.C. 960 (b)(1). Sections 842 (b)(1) and 960(b)(1) are in all other respects treated identically for penalty purposes and there appears to be no valid reason for the disparity created as a result of the limited amendment in section 6452.

Sec. 514.—Elimination of outmoded language relating to parole.

This section is technical and eliminates various provisions in the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act which provide that an individual convicted under the relevant statute shall not be eligible for parole.

Sec. 515.—Conforming amendment to provision punishing a second offense of distributing drugs to a minor.

The proposed amendment would increase the mandatory minimum sentence under subsection (b) to three years, the same as that for second offenses under the companion statute, 21 U.S.C. 860(b).

Sec. 516.—Conditional waiver of 4-year limitation for effective BJA projects.

The proposed new section would establish a "graduation" program that allows BJA to waive the four-year limitation for programs or projects that are proven to be effective subject to certain conditions. These conditions include a declining Federal share and a plan to continue programs or projects without Federal assistance after the sixth year. The Federal share would be limited to 50 percent for the fifth year and 25 percent for the sixth year. States are required to submit to the Bureau a plan showing how the program or project would be funded by non-Federal sources after the sixth year.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1991 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending, credit, and revenues for fiscal year 1991.

This is the seventh report of the first session of the 102d Congress. This report is based on the revised budget aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal year 1991 as authorized in section 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 121 and as submitted to the House on May 29, 1991.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, credit authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 121, the Fiscal Year 1992 Budget Resolution, outlined procedures for revising the fiscal year 1991 budget aggregates and allocations. This section, applicable only to the House of Representatives, permits the aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal year 1991 to be revised to make them consistent with the discretionary caps and pay-as-you-go provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to section 12 of H. Con. Res. 121 were printed in the Congressional Record on May 29, 1991, page H. 3698. The new aggregates and committee allocations set all direct spending and revenues exactly at current baseline levels using Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates. For discretionary appropriations, the new allocation exactly equals the sum of the existing discretionary caps.

As specified in Section 12, committees are not required to subdivide the fiscal year 1991 amounts allocated to them, and enforcement of the allocations will be based on the total amounts allocated to a committee.

In order to facilitate enforcement under section 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am herewith transmitting the status report for fiscal year 1991 reflecting the changes in budget aggregates and allocations as authorized by Section 12.

The enclosed tables compare enacted legislation to each committee's 302(a) allocation of discretionary new budget authority, new entitlement authority, new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1991 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 310 AS REVISED PURSUANT TO SECTION 12 OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF AUG. 2, 1991

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level	1,187,800	1,155,800	793,000
Current level	1,187,563	1,155,200	793,000
Amount over ceilings	237	600	
Amount over ceilings			
Amount over floor			

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure that provides new budget or entitlement authority, that is not included in the current level estimate, and that exceeds \$237 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310, as revised, to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure that provides new budget or entitlement authority, that is not included in the current level estimate, and that exceeds \$600 million in outlays for fiscal 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310, as revised, to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate for fiscal year 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310, as revised.

FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET AUTHORITY—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION ALLOCATION BY COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

(In millions of dollars)

	Current level		
	Budget authority	Direct loans	Primary loan guarantees
House Committee			
Agriculture	0	0	0
Appropriations	-237	0	0
Armed Services	0	0	0
Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0
Education and Labor	0	0	0
Energy and Commerce	0	0	0
Foreign Affairs	0	0	0
Government Operations	0	0	0
House Administration	0	0	0
Interior and Insular Affairs	0	0	0
Judiciary	0	0	0
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	0	0	0
Post Office and Civil Service	0	0	0
Public Works and Transportation	0	0	0
Science, Space and Technology	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	0	0	0
Ways and Means	0	0	0

Note.—Committees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(a) allocation for discretionary action.

FISCAL YEAR 1991 ALLOCATION OF NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY (NEA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

(In millions of dollars)

Committee	Allocation	Reported ¹	Enacted ²	Enacted over (+)/under (-) allocation
Agriculture	0	0	0	0

FISCAL YEAR 1991 ALLOCATION OF NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY (NEA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 302—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

Committee	Allocation	Reported ¹	Enacted ²	Enacted over (+)/under (-) allocation
Appropriations	0	0	0	0
Armed Services	0	0	0	0
Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Education and Labor	0	0	0	0
Energy and Commerce	0	0	0	0
Foreign Affairs	0	0	0	0
Government Operations	0	0	0	0
House Administration	0	0	0	0
Interior and Insular Affairs	0	0	0	0
Judiciary	0	0	0	0
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	0	0	0	0
Post Office and Civil Service	0	0	0	0
Public Works and Transportation	0	0	0	0
Science, Space and Technology	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means	0	0	0	0

¹ These figures are used for 401(b)(2) of the Budget Act.² These figures are used for 302(f) points of order.U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1991.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting tab provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, estimated revenues, and direct and guaranteed loan levels. These estimates are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget agreed to on May 22, 1991 and are compared to the revised 1991 budget aggregates pursuant to section 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 121. This report, for fiscal year 1991, is tabulated as of close of business August 2, 1991 and is summarized in the following table (in millions of dollars).

	On-budget current level	Revised on-budget aggregates	Current level +/- aggregates
Budget authority	1,187,563	1,187,800	-237
Outlays	1,155,200	1,155,800	-600
Revenues	793,000	793,000	
Direct loans	18,355	18,355	
Guaranteed loans	109,767	109,767	

Since my last report, dated July 10, 1991, there has been no action that affects the current level of spending or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 102D CONG., 1ST
SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1991
AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS AUG. 2, 1991

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues			793,001
Permanent appropriations	740,762	683,281	
Other legislation	668,128	695,667	
Offsetting receipts	-225,151	-225,151	
Total enacted in previous sessions	1,183,740	1,153,797	793,001
II. Enacted this session:			
Extending IRS deadline for Desert Storm troops (Public Law 102-2)			-1

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 102D CONG., 1ST
SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1991
AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS AUG. 2, 1991—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Veteran's education, employment and training amendments (Public Law 102-16)	(1)	(1)	
Disaster emergency supplemental appropriations, 1991 (Public Law 102-27)	3,823	1,401	
Higher education technical amendments (Public Law 102-26)	3	3	
OMB discretionary sequester	-2	-1	
Emergency supplemental for humanitarian assistance (Public Law 102-55)	(1)		
Total enacted this session	3,824	1,403	-1
III. Continuing resolution authority			
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses			
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory adjustments required to conform with current law estimates in budget resolution			
On-budget current level	1,187,563	1,155,200	793,000
Revised on-budget aggregates	1,187,800	1,155,800	793,000
Amount remaining: Over budget resolution			
Under budget resolution	237	600	

¹ Less than \$500,000.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

REGULATION WILL JEOPARDIZE
MEDICAID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about a proposed regulation by the Health Care Financing Administration that is included in today's Federal Register.

This proposed regulation will severely limit Alabama's flexibility to fund the \$1.6 billion budget for Medicaid patients. Currently Alabama is scheduled to begin collecting taxes from health care providers on January 1. These taxes would help our State raise almost \$800 million for Alabama's children and families. Without this substantial funding, our Medicaid Program will be underfunded and very restrictive. It is estimated by the Alabama Medicaid Agency that more than 10,000 patients would be eliminated from the program.

Medicaid provides health insurance for the neediest segment of our population. This regulation would be hardest on the children and their families who would no longer have coverage for any illnesses.

I fear that a scaled back Medicaid Program would also increase our infant mortality rate. In the past several years, with a growing budget Alabama has been able to provide more services to pregnant women and infants. It would be a tragedy to erase these important advances in the saving of our babies.

There is a real danger that all Medicaid patients will no longer receive coverage for prescription drugs. For many older patients this denial would create a severe hardship.

In addition, these changes will threaten our hospitals. In several of the rural counties that I represent our hospitals are already struggling to survive. These reduced payments will probably close their doors.

I regret that President Bush is so intent on attacking the most vulnerable part of our population. It is my hope that this regulation will be dramatically changed to allow States such as Alabama to continue to improve their programs.

FORT SHERIDAN NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Speaker, tens of thousands of American veterans have paid the price in broken bodies and lost lives to keep our country free. The least we can do is provide them with a final resting place that is pleasing and accessible to their loved ones.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has declared that no other region of this country has a greater need for a veterans' cemetery than metropolitan Chicago. Fortunately, the Chicago area has an ideal site for a new national cemetery on roughly 200 acres of undeveloped land at Fort Sheridan, IL.

Some have argued that the development of a golf course should be given priority at Fort Sheridan, where a U.S. Army base is expected to close in 1994. I cannot understand how a golf course could possibly be given a priority higher than a national veterans cemetery.

Congressman PHILIP CRANE and I have introduced a bipartisan bill, H.R. 315, that would authorize a transfer of the 200 acres at Fort Sheridan from the Army to the Department of Veterans Affairs for use as a cemetery. Our bill is before the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Madam Speaker, as debate continues on the future of Fort Sheridan, I hope my colleagues will take note of a guest column that was published in Monday's Chicago Tribune. The author of this essay argues eloquently in favor of a national veterans cemetery at Fort Sheridan. His column reads as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 9, 1991]

VETERANS EARNED BURIAL AT FT. SHERIDAN
(By Rick Ellert)

LAKE ZURICH.—The Aug. 8 editorial, "A bleak future for Ft. Sheridan," is one of the most anti-veteran pieces I've ever read. It whines about a veterans' cemetery being "put on the northern end—intended for a golf course and open space."

This area was intended for no such thing; the Fort Sheridan Commission merely recommended this accommodation. The Tribune editorial smacks of elitism and fans selfish desires of a few to buffer affluent neighborhoods with something like a golf course or a park.

The environmental issue is a red herring. The north side of Ft. Sheridan has a small cemetery in place and easily lends itself to a national cemetery. However, this area is as environmentally pristine as a vacant lot in the Loop.

The issue transcends "land use." The national cemeteries were born of the tragedy of

the Civil War. Tens of thousands of soldiers were hastily buried or left where they fell. In 1865 a reburial program was initiated and by 1870 more than 300,000 soldiers had been buried in 70 national cemeteries; 143,000 were unknown. From this came the development of a national policy to care for the graves of veterans in an orderly and dignified way.

The editorial suggests the base be "returned to the people who own it." What cross-section of our society better represents "the people"? The City of Chicago and its collar counties contain more than 700,000 veterans. Nationwide there are 27 million veterans and their spouses eligible for interment in veterans' cemeteries. So to what "people" is the editorial aimed?

It is not a cliché to say that this land has already been purchased by our nation's veterans. From Bunker Hill to Bastogne, from Inchon to Khe Sanh and Khafji, young Americans have suffered and continue to pay the price in every veteran's hospital across this land.

Chicagoland has been designated by the Department of Veterans Affairs as the area most in need of a national cemetery. Ft. Sheridan is vitally important because of its proximity to Chicago and the fort's historical significance. The families and friends of the area's veterans do not need indignity added to their suffering by driving a long distance to honor their loved ones.

Recently the Lake County Forest Preserve system offered \$10 million for the area requested by the Department of Veterans Affairs. A local politician was quoted as saying, "It's \$10 million more than the VA is offering." There's political logic for you: Let Lake County taxpayers fork over another \$10 million for a park that would be utilized only by those near the fort.

If the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs can work out an accommodation between themselves, with the transfer of funds or land already budgeted, then it's just going from one pocket to another.

Is the national cemetery system to be relegated to the cheapest land, farther from the veterans' homes, out of sight and surrounded by fields of corn? I think not. We should be saying that sacrifice is worthy of our homage.

The future is not bleak for Ft. Sheridan. A national cemetery will bring the entire community together. It will give Chicagoland the opportunity to establish an "Arlington of the Midwest," to recall the aspirations of our youth and properly mourn all that we lost.

ISRAEL IS A RELIABLE, STRONG ALLY, WORTHY OF RECEIVING LOAN GUARANTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STALLINGS. Madam Speaker, as the House begins consideration of the absorption guarantee program to Israel, I wanted to voice my support for this measure. At this stage of the debate, I wish to make only two preliminary points.

First, the last 20 years have been marked by a United States foreign policy that emphasized the free immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. This policy remains an essential element in our efforts to maintain strong relations with the Soviet Union. These strong relations

with the Soviet Union would not be possible without free emigration of its Jewish population.

To the extent that the proposed guarantees make such immigration possible, they must be seen as a continuation of a policy begun many years ago. They are at once the fulfillment of an obligation incurred when we adopted the policy, and the mechanism to permit fruition of its goals.

Second, Israel has been a reliable friend and a strong democratic ally. Like any good friend, Israel has kept its promises, and that includes past promises to repay United States loans. Israel has never defaulted on any loan extended by the United States. Moreover, standard economic measures, such as the ratio of external debt to GDP, and the stability of its banking system, make it clear Israel is a good risk. Its financial house is in order.

Madam Speaker, I hope to have the opportunity to set out other aspects of my thinking on this issue in the future. But for now it seems to me that the perfect repayment record of Israel should leave little doubt that it is worthy of receiving these loan guarantees, and the history of our own policy suggests it is in our interests to extend them.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my 60-minute special order and request a 5-minute special order in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BIGOTRY AGAINST THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker and all fellow Americans who follow the proceedings of this Congress, either by its written document printed the next day or by C-SPAN with a growing audience somewhere over 1,200,000, I would suggest you continue to follow these proceedings for the next hour or two for a special order on the distinguished Member who chose to take over the leadership of the Negro College Fund rather than continue here as one of the leaders in the majority. I am very pleased to give up my hour and try to cram an hour's worth of work into 4½ minutes here, on the subject of bigotry and prejudice in this Congress. I cannot think of a group, a caucus, a subcommittee, a committee, or anybody in this Chamber or the other body that is more knowledgeable from a personal standpoint or from years of living than the Black Caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives, who would be more sensitive to, or understanding of, bigotry.

Madam Speaker, the bigotry I speak of in this case is vented toward my re-

ligion, my Roman Catholic faith. And it just occurred to me while waiting to speak that I cannot imagine what it would be like in modern America to be an African-American woman with an Hispanic name who loves and practices her Roman Catholic faith. Talk about someone that would be getting hit from all sides on bigotry and narrowmindedness. That would be the person. And such a lady would find that if she were attacked for her gender, her defenders would be there in more numbers, than her attackers. If attacked for her Hispanic heritage or Hispanic name, groups all across this country and the dominant media culture, the liberal culture that rules Hollywood, television, the soap operas, is right there to defend any attacks far more in numbers than her attackers. For an African-American, however horrible the pockets of racism are in this country that would judge a person by the color of their skin; do not worry. Everybody in this House would stand up, if not giving their heartfelt support, then lip service at least. The dominant media culture would weigh in her favor. But if that lady has her Catholic faith attacked, she twists in the wind alone because mass media in this country has decided that my beloved religion is fair game, that one can be an anti-Catholic bigot in this country and never be so designated.

As I said in my 1-minute speech at the beginning of our session today, a PBS station, which takes in a lot of Federal money despite all well-publicized pledge weeks; this PBS station in Los Angeles, whose president, Mr. William Kobin, told me he had agonized over his decision to run a bigoted half-hour film, against the Catholic Church did so despite its obviously bigoted slant. The film had the insidious title, "Stop the Church," and, as I said earlier, who would dare run such a film in America today on a public, taxpayer-financed, PBS station? By the way, this film was kiboshed; yes, censored, if you want to use that tough word, by KCET. That means Community Educational Television, and the Los Angeles station ran the film anyway. Imagine a film that says "Stop African-Americans," or "Stop Judaism," "Stop Hispanic-Americans." Nobody would tolerate something like that, but this vicious film is an attack upon Catholicism in general, Cardinal John Joseph O'Connor of New York, the archbishop of New York, in particular.

It is an attack on the Catholic Church, indeed, the very building that was my parish when I was born and where I was baptized in May 1933, a month after I was born, and where my parents were married on June 27, 1929. St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York is one landmark on this planet that I consider a dear treasure to me and my family. And to see radical activist ho-

mosexuals go in there, chain themselves to pews, mouth off obscenities, scream at the pastor of the church, the cardinal of New York, take communion in the hand or mouth and then spit it out on the ground is more than I can bear.

I will never forget December 10, 1989, 2 years ago, when this attack was made on my former parish church, this beautiful cathedral built with the dimes of Irish-American immigrants, Italian-American immigrants, and many other faithful who came to this land between the Civil War and the outbreak of World War II.

Now this morning I said that I was going to take this book that was released in March when I was out of the country called, "Media Coverage of the Catholic Church by Dominant Media." This was by Robert Lichter, Ph.D., his wife, Dr. Linda Lichter, who coauthored the study along with Daniel Amundson. This is the same Lichter of Lichter-Rothman, one of the greatest survey organizations in this country, owing to their post-survey analysis abilities.

□ 1640

I do believe that the Lichters and Mr. Rothman and their other partner are of the Jewish faith, which makes it very credible so this is not some inside job whining from members of the Catholic Church in America, but is an objective press release. I am going to put it in the RECORD, and in whatever time I have left I am going to explain just a little bit about what is here.

I am going to submit this to our recording clerks here so they can run an analysis of how much it will cost to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And I will come into the well and take the political heat for whatever amount of money it takes to print this report in toto. I said this morning that I would break it down into 13 or 12 paragraphs, but that is not fair to the report. You could put this in the RECORD over a period of 12 days, but I want it all in the RECORD all at once, because it involves bigotry in America. Just as I back up any minority or majority group in this country to try and stop bigotry, I will take the heat and stand right here and tell the American people what it costs and ask unanimous consent for it to go in toto. So this will probably be inserted at the end of next week, after I have had a chance to get a cost analysis.

As to the press conference releasing this book, let me say that I will submit the press release. Anybody interested in this book or the synopsis of the press release can look at the press release in today's RECORD and the book next week.

Madam Speaker, I will now go back to my office and listen to the tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania the Reverend Congressman William Gray.

SEQUENCE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. ESPY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for 1 hour which had been assigned to me be allowed to precede the special order time slot which had been assigned to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SEQUENCE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order assigned to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] immediately follow the special order presently being entered into by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF BLACK AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ESPY. Madam Speaker, I have the special privilege of chairing the Congressional Black Caucus's 21st Annual Legislative Weekend. It is indeed a big weekend for us. We expect approximately 25,000 African-American men, women, and children to travel to Washington for a 5-day period of reflection, of discussion, and indeed of problem resolution.

Over this 5-day period, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will chair over 50 workshops focusing on all manner of issues impacting and affecting our communities across this Nation.

So we would like to take this time to soberly review the state of the Union and the state of black Americans in the United States. For the next hour and indeed for the next 2 hours we will address the issue of black men at risk, for we know that 1 out of every 5 black men below the age of 25 will run the risk of being imprisoned. We have Members here to address the status of our cities and in fact the decay which is occurring within our cities. We have Members to talk about education and its impact on black students, minority business and finance, health and welfare, and civil rights. We have the Delegate from the District of Columbia, who will indeed speak on the issue of admission of the District of Columbia as a State within the United States, and we have other Members expert in their own right, serving as chair and subcommittee chair of their committees, to speak on these issues.

I would also like to say that the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], has been unexpectedly called away and has asked me to coordinate this special order in his stead, and I am only proud to do that.

So, Madam Speaker, we have assembled in the House Chamber to share our perspectives on the state of the Union and the state of black America, and to formally kick off this year's Annual Legislative Weekend activities on Capitol Hill.

During the next few days the Congressional Black Caucus will address the vital issues facing African-Americans and our Nation. We will honor Justice Thurgood Marshall and other outstanding African-Americans who exemplify the best of our heritage. We will meet with constituents from across the country who have taken the time and who have gone to the expense of traveling from various points across the country to come to Washington to share in the activities over this legislative weekend.

Our theme for this 21st Annual Legislative Weekend is "The African-American Challenge," which in our opinion means defying the odds and also at the same time expanding opportunities. It is a theme which reflects the central thrust of our history while making clear the challenge we face today.

Madam Speaker, throughout our history African-Americans have been defying the odds. Ours is the story of a people who have survived the dehumanization of slavery, endured the pain of segregation, and repelled the hostility of racism. It is the story of a people who have overcome tremendous adversity and yet excelled in spite of it.

When we ponder the plight of African-Americans, we must remember that our forefathers did not land at Ellis Island looking for freedom and opportunity. In fact, Madam Speaker, they arrived in bondage, denied even the right to own their own selves. So our right to be Members of Congress cannot be taken for granted, and it was not granted at birth. So indeed we cannot take it for granted, and we have an obligation to educate and to speak out on the issues affecting our constituents and in fact to raise our voices to talk about the plight of our people and things affecting our people throughout this Nation.

So because of our special history, we have a special responsibility to the African-American community, to our Nation, and to the world.

From our perspective, Madam Speaker, the state of the Union is not good. As our departing colleague, Bill Gray, said recently, for too many Americans "the American dream looks to be more of a remnant of our past than a fact of our future." The past 12 years have been great for the wealthiest of Americans. Their incomes have soared by 75

percent, but for the rest of America incomes have fallen or have remained stagnant.

For the first time millions of Americans can no longer say with confidence that their children will live better than they did. For millions of African-Americans the hope and promise spawned by the 1960's has been replaced by the hopelessness and despair of the 1980's and the national indifference of the 1990's.

It is a great irony, but while we applaud the success of the struggle for democracy in the Soviet Union, millions of Americans feel as if they have no stake in their own democracy.

So our challenge today is to articulate a way out of this tremendous difficulty. Our challenge is to make the political process relevant to the real problems facing our constituents and our Nation. We believe that if we save the Nation, we will save our constituents.

So in order to meet our challenge today, we must gain inspiration and strength from our history of defying odds while calling on the spirit which has brought us this far. It is a spirit that tells us that no matter how high the mountain, we can make it over the top, no matter how many hungry sharks infest the water, we can make it across, and no matter how dark the night, we can make it until the morning comes. With this faith, Madam Speaker, we can move mountains, we can cross rivers, we can overcome any barrier. Our challenge today is to defy the odds and to expand opportunities for all Americans. I call now upon our colleagues to share their ideas about how this will be done.

Madam Speaker, I would first yield to the dean of black women in the Congress, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

□ 1650

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in addressing the dismaying and disheartening conditions besetting the American-African community, a community that teeters on the brink of disaster.

As the President and much of Congress turns their eyes and opens their hearts to the people and events of Eastern Europe, what is now still called I suppose a U.S.S.R. and the Middle East, this attention is disturbing to many of us whose constituents do not find similar sympathy, concern, and certainly little if any executive leadership directed toward their plight.

Instead, our concerns are met with disregard and indifference, as evidenced by the callous characterization and dismissal of the civil rights bill as promoting a quota system.

When we are told that billions of our dollars are needed in foreign countries

to help divert the destabilizing effects of hunger, we wonder where the concern is for the destabilizing effects of hunger and homelessness right here in America, right here in our inner cities.

In my congressional district in Chicago, where in many communities therein unemployment is at an all time 60 to 65 percent level, the affordable housing remains unattended by the Bush administration, and, therefore, thousands of families must scurry to find shelter now, as the winds of fall stir the memories of winter.

While the administration prepares to address its request for billions in aid for the people of Eastern Europe and for the Soviet Union, surely hungry and homeless Americans deserve to be considered for assistance to avert the very destabilizing effects of bitter cold for which Chicago is known.

Do not these effects have any input at all in the administration? Why is it that they seem not to have any merit when the administration brings up its program?

We in America extoll the virtues of education and the benefits one accrues as the result of having received it. Yet, increasingly, this administration shifts funds from proven programs, such as Head Start, to fund greater expenses in penal incarceration.

Conceivably, many of those misguided youth who are undereducated and unemployed, who are swelling our prison population, conceivably would have been better off had similar millions been spent in early childhood education. Possibly, then they would be paying taxes, instead of consuming these funds.

Similarly, we watch as local school districts struggle to meet budgets and to provide teachers with an appropriate remuneration, which they don't always find the ability to do.

African-American children must wonder, when does the nightmare on my street end? When does the nightmare in my schools end, for many of those students do not have necessary paper, pencils, erasers, and chalk, from which to study and from which to become educated.

Now, we as African-Americans do not begrudge sharing our largesse of our Nation with others who are less fortunate, but we do take offense at having the very real needs of our own less fortunate Americans put at the bottom of the list of priorities.

So I ask the President to tell me, where is the justice for all in this unjust situation?

Mr. ESPY. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

We have a Member of Congress here, one of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who serves on the very important Committee of Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and also serves as a member of the Select Committee on Hunger, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you very much. I would like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for taking the time out so we might be able to focus upon that which I consider to be one of the most neglected issues in America, and that is the condition of our urban communities.

Madam Speaker, I think that there are many who do not realize by virtue of the fact that they never come into the communities that have been impacted by the policies of this Nation over the last few years. As a Representative of New York, I clearly understand that as New York goes, so goes the rest of the Nation. As a microcosm of the very problems that are existent everywhere in this Nation, it has become very clear to me that the problems of unemployment, the problems of AIDS, the problems of pollution, the problems of lack of adequate education, the problems of lack of affordable housing, teen pregnancy, killing by gangs on our streets, are not only a New York problem, but a national problem.

Yet those who in many instances have the responsibility for making the decisions which ultimately help to solve these problems, look at the communities in which they occur and say to themselves that this does not have any impact on my life.

The reality is that the problems of urban America are not problems that are restricted by borders. There is no geographical boundary that separates urban America from suburban America. The boundary that has been created is between those who are the haves and those who are the have nots. But in reality, that boundary becomes less visionary as time goes on and the problems of urban America move into suburban America.

Therefore, the reality is that all of us must see ourselves as being participants in the process of bringing about a better change for urban America, because it is the change that will help us to become the Nation of strength that we ought to be.

I have long argued that our problem is not whether or not the Soviet Union would come and attack America. Because of the changes that have taken place over the last few years, we realize that all the more.

There is a reality, though, that our greatest crisis is not the war that is coming from without, but the war that is coming from within. As long as we neglect the concerns of the people of our Nation, as long as we continue to give them that lack of hope, that ultimately wells up in an outburst where they have no choice but to react to the conditions around them. They see no other way out but to make some expression, some vocal expression, some visible expression, that says we can no longer tolerate these living conditions.

Places like New York, where everywhere there are people that are homeless

walking the streets, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, cities that represent the very essence of life in America by virtue of the size of their populations, when New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and other major cities are impacted in the way they are, every city in America is impacted. Even small cities such as Bridgeport, which declared bankruptcy because its problems got too great for it to solve.

The problems are universal. We must address them. Yes, as the speaker before me has indicated, our concern is about what happens to the rest of this universe. But our concerns must first start with an understanding that we must solve some of our problems at home.

It is immoral, it is unconscionable, to think that in a nation that prides itself on its Constitution and markets its democracy to other nations of the world, presenting it as if it is a panacea, letting it be the model for other nations to try to pattern themselves after, and yet, within its own borders, it allows the kinds of decadence and decay to take place that is a part of the society of so many of the people who live within it and call themselves its citizens.

We must change our priorities. A part of that priority change must be an understanding that we have an obligation to provide housing to our people. We have an obligation to provide an adequate education to every American, regardless of race or color. We have an obligation to lift the standard of living so that our people are able to compete with others from these newly emerging democratic nations, so that they will be able to stand fast and compete with them, knowing that there is no barrier to their ultimate success.

The possibility of achievement exists within every child in America, whether they are born in an urban community or other parts of our society. The reality is we must help them to fulfill that potential and that possibility. It can only be done when we look to America as a whole, and not look at it in parts and fragments and pieces. When we look at America, not on the basis of who is represented by urban America, on the basis of our definition of their color, on the basis of definitions of their limitations, but look at them and understand that they have the possibility to participate in the process of helping to make America the great Nation that it ought to be.

If we are great in the eyes of those who are without our borders, then we must now do all for urban America, so that we can be great in the eyes of those who are within our borders.

Let us change our priorities. Let us change the standard of living for all Americans. Let us change the very face of urban America, so that it can reflect the America that we all dream of.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement.

Madam Speaker, the fact is that we have risen to some lofty leadership positions within this Congress. The next speaker holds such a position.

The gentleman from the great State of Missouri [Mr. CLAY], who chairs the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, who stands as one advocate for and a protector of the interests of working men and women.

□ 1700

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I first of all command and thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for calling this special order and making it possible for us to document for this Nation the status of black America.

Madam Speaker, I rise to declare my view on the state of the Union and black America. Under recent administrations, rather than allowing blacks to take part as full partners in shaping the destiny of America, we have been shunted aside.

A combination of hard work and direct Government assistance have improved the living conditions of the average American citizen, but black people were left out. Now when we demand similar Government support we are told there is a new color-blind society that prohibits special consideration for any group—especially our group. We are expected to pull ourselves out of the depths of poverty and deprivation by hard work and self-reliance alone.

But, Madam Speaker, hard work and self-reliance have never enabled a race of people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. Government policies are directly responsible for moving other Americans to middle-class status. The Government provided the resources that allowed them to move into adequate housing with front lawns and swimming pools and provided them with easy access to the central cities where their jobs were located by building freeways and subsidizing rapid transit.

Government played the key role. Black people were not given the opportunity to share in the great American experiment.

We were handicapped, victimized—not by accident, not by oversight, but by deliberate acts of Government policy. While the racist policies of today may not be as overt as in the past, the effect is the same. Today, the chances of enacting an effective civil rights law are slim. Today, we have a Supreme Court that gnaws away at gains made previously in job protection, human rights, and civil rights.

The state of black America will continue to be deplorable until we demand that Government become a partner with us in moving out of the malaise that now has us in its grip. We don't have to be ashamed to petition our Government for financial and economic assistance in order to right historical wrongs.

We don't have to apologize for expecting our Government to correct long-standing inequities and abolish unequal treatment based on race. White America did not get where it is without vast infusions of Government resources into their businesses and in other aspects of life. And we are not going to rebuild our inner city neighborhoods and eliminate the vast disparity in employment by resorting to nickel-and-dime self-help programs.

We need Government policy that compels insurance companies to insure our properties at reasonable and fair premiums; that makes banks loan money available to financially qualified black property owners for new construction, rehab, and remodeling. We need a Government policy that enforces laws enacted to prohibit discrimination in employment. And we must insist that affirmative action is a legitimate, in fact, the most effective means of changing endemic, pervasive, institutionalized racism.

When we accomplish these goals, we will be able to proclaim at one of our Congressional Black Caucus legislative weekends that the state of black America is strong and healthy. Until then we have much work to accomplish.

Mr. ESPY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement and would like to say that I associate myself with his statement.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] who has served as former chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and currently serves, among other things, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and who distinguishes himself as chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to congratulate him on what is going to be an outstanding Congressional Black Caucus Weekend.

I have had the honor of serving as chairman of that weekend, and I know that it is no task that goes undone that the chairman does not directly oversee. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] has done an outstanding job, not only in coordinating this special order but the entire weekend.

America's urban centers which once symbolized hope and opportunity have become centers of poverty, drugs, violence, and despair. The indicators of urban decay are numerous and common to cities across the Nation. One of the most disturbing of these is police brutality and misconduct—hardly a new phenomenon for African-Americans.

It took the videotaped March 3 beating of Rodney G. King by officers of the Los Angeles Police Department which shocked Americans nationwide to focus national attention on this long-neglected problem. Following the King incident, an independent commission found a persistent pattern of excessive

force, racist and sexist attitudes, and inadequate training of LAPD officers.

Police brutality, however, is not confined to Los Angeles. Similar incidents of police brutality have come to light in other cities across the country, revealing the national scope of this disturbing problem. A recent lawsuit revealed that a special unit in the police department in Reynoldsburg, OH, specifically targeted African-Americans for arrest.

The New York City Civil Liberties Union has compiled affidavits testifying that bystanders who complain about police actions are arrested and run through the system by New York City police officers. The Massachusetts attorney general's office found recently that Boston police routinely conducted unconstitutional stops and searches of minority individuals including requiring youths to submit to strip searches in public. The beating of a man by police in Clarksdale, MS, this past Saturday has resulted in the firing of one officer, the suspension of five others, and the initiation of an FBI investigation into the incident. This week, Washington, DC police appeared to have used excessive force against a young Howard University student.

The intense violence in our cities has put a great strain on police officers and citizens alike. The proliferation of automatic and semiautomatic assault weapons, coupled with the growth of the urban drug trade and gang activity, have created an environment in which the lives of our police officers and citizens are constantly at risk. The inability of some officers to communicate effectively across cultural lines has heightened tension and mistrust between minority communities and police.

There is a need for improved police training in the area of race relations, as our society grows increasingly multicultural. Independent citizen review boards and a restructuring of departmental chains of command may also be in order. The police have the opportunity and the responsibility to set the tone for improved community relations. That tone must be positive and abuse of police power must cease.

Congress has moved to increase accountability among State and local law enforcement organizations and officers. I joined chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights DON EDWARDS and members of the Congressional Black Caucus in "introducing the Police Accountability Act of 1991" (H.R. 2972). The bill would allow the U.S. Attorney General and injured persons to sue police departments that tolerate or encourage excessive force, create a new Federal criminal statute to hold police departments and individual officers accountable for police brutality, and require the Attorney General to collect statistical data from State and local

governments on police brutality complaints.

Madam Speaker. The problem of police brutality cannot be totally solved, however, without effectively addressing the basic problems which afflict our cities. Our Government must increase opportunities for education, housing, healthcare, job training, and employment. This must be our Nation's highest priority. Indeed, the pervasive indicators of urban decay signal nothing if not the critical need for a new domestic agenda to revitalize America's cities and towns.

Congressional Black Caucus members have been at the forefront of efforts to cultivate a more sound domestic policy agenda in the Congress. Events during the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's 21st Annual Legislative Weekend will address crucial domestic issues, and we will develop strategies to effect meaningful change and reverse the trend of urban decay in our cities and towns. I look forward to a productive weekend.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement and also for his compliment and certainly will echo what the gentleman said and will associate myself with his statements.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. COLLINS], from the great city of Detroit, who fills so capably the shoes of our retired member, George Crockett.

□ 1710

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity and thank the distinguished gentleman from the State of Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for yielding this time to allow me to speak to the Congressional Black Caucus state of the Union on black America.

When I think of the state of the Union and black America, the Latin phrase "res ipsa loquitur" immediately comes to mind. It means "the facts speak for themselves."

The very idea, that we speak of black America as isolated from the rest of the United States of America shows how deeply rooted the inequities suffered by African-Americans living in this "land of the free and home of the brave" really are. African-American survival in America is a testament to our strength and our ability to defy all odds.

More than 100 years ago, Dickens wrote in his classic novel "Great Expectations," "**** there is nothing so finely perceived and so finely felt, as injustice." In black America, injustice is a thread woven into the cloth of everyday life. We look at employment, housing, health, and child care and there it is—injustice.

African-Americans are living in cities crumbling from the effects of economic abandonment and bureaucratic apathy.

Drugs and crime are thriving in black America—destroying our children and robbing them of the bright futures they deserve. Imprisonment and early violent death has grappled our young black males—destroying the procreators of our next generation.

The collapse of communism in Russia and the rise of new democracies gives me hope as I look forward to the collapse of racism in America and the rise of real freedom and equality for all of black America. The death of racism will allow young African-Americans to overcome obstacles and enjoy expanded opportunities.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement and certainly appreciate the things she said.

Mr. Speaker, our next petitioner is also a very dynamic woman who came to the attention of the Nation before she entered into the Halls of this august body. As a member of the California Assembly, MAXINE WATERS shook things up there for good. She brings that same kind of dynamism, that same kind of activism and that same kind of intensity to the issues that affect us in the Halls of Congress. As a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, she has a very strong voice in the areas of minority business and finance, and she certainly has shaken things up here as well.

So Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I would like to commend the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], for organizing this opportunity for us to talk about the state of black America.

So today members of the Congressional Black Caucus will present the Nation with our state of black America. The message you will hear in our voices will be messages of grief, anger, and passion as we portray the catastrophe that the African-American community suffers, the poverty, the homelessness, the drugs and violence, infant mortality, plagues and afflictions, the need for jobs, education, and hope. Our listeners may or may not be moved by what we say here today. However, no one disputes the reality; but no one believes anything will be done.

The political gridlock makes Los Angeles freeways look fluid. There is no money. There is no hope. Conservatives invent new ways to push around the poor without a prayer of providing an answer to their needs.

What are we saying here today? It is beginning to sound familiar. Yes, Mr. Bush, there is no domestic agenda. America is indeed deteriorating.

It is not simply black America that is in trouble. Working class whites will be hit just as hard as blacks by Presi-

dent Bush's unwillingness to extend unemployment benefits. Poor whites are in desperate need of health services and educational opportunities also.

America is in trouble. However, we must not simply bemoan the tragic state of affairs in our country. We must seize the opportunity to turn our attention to America's needs.

Charity begins at home and spreads abroad. The cold war is over. We really should be celebrating. The Soviet Union has surrendered. The great sacrifices we have made over the past 40 years are at an end. Our soldiers, our resources, our new world awaits us.

We spend over half of our military budget, about \$150 billion a year, as a subsidy to our European allies to defend them against the threat of a surprise Soviet attack. Some of us thought that was an exorbitant subsidy to rich allies who really could defend themselves. Some of us thought we were not spending enough. It no longer matters. The Russians are not coming. The Communist threat has vanished. The so-called Evil Empire really does not exist and there is no threat. The mission no longer makes sense. We have no choice but to plan for conversion to a new world.

Americans will not allow their tax dollars to be squandered on a defense budget it does not need. Nor will Americans allow their tax dollars to be used to support housing, education, and business opportunities for the Soviet Union while our communities continue to suffer.

We really should be celebrating. We really should celebrate today. But we must celebrate and act. Across the world democratic movements are bringing down walls and opening up hopes. This country cannot remain frozen in a world of change. We must bring down the foolish budgetary walls that prohibit transfer of resources from military to civilian spending passed in folly as the cold war was coming to an end.

We must act to use the blessed opportunity we have been given to rebuild our opportunities here. Our opportunity here is clear. There has never been a better chance for dramatic change in 45 years.

My friends, it is no longer time to mourn. It is time to move. The Congressional Black Caucus can offer the leadership to this Congress and to this Nation. We are pained indeed, but we are not hopeless. We understand that we have power, and it is time for us to use that power. It is time for us to say to President Bush, to the leadership, to the world, we will not continue to allow this madness with the budget to continue. We must get in the forefront of undoing the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. We must say it is time to use those dollars from the defense budget to invest in our communities, to invest in America.

We can do that.

□ 1720

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELLUMS). The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings of the House are in direct violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. ESPY. I thank the Speaker.

I would just say that all of us gathered on the floor certainly realize what is in the hearts of all those listening and looking on.

We thank the gentlewoman from California for her very powerful statement and turn now to another distinguished woman within the Halls of Congress, who represents this great District of Columbia, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], who in a very short time has rendered distinguished service inside of this body and who, along with the new Mayor of the District of Columbia, has brought greater attention to the problems of the District, and, in fact, has gotten a little bit more money, a few more dollars. Mr. Speaker, we think that these are just mere coins compared to what they ought to be receiving.

It is unfortunate, when we think that within the Capital City of the greatest democracy within the world, this Capital City, this Congress is contained within the city which still has not given the District full democratic rights.

Therefore, the next speaker has no vote, but that is something. Mr. Speaker, that we seek to change, so we call upon now the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I use this opportunity, as well, to thank the gentleman for his extraordinary leadership this entire week, including this opportunity for this special order.

Madam Speaker, on the 21st anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus, I begin by bidding the fondest of farewells and the most elaborate of thank-you's to the Reverend Mr. William Gray for his extraordinary contributions to America, to African-Americans and to 600,000 Washingtonians. Just this morning, Madam Speaker, we had a standing-room-only crowd at a forum on democracy. It was entitled "D.C. Statehood: What It Means to Black America." Washingtonians were joined by other Americans to both gain information and to bear witness. Together their presence told the assembled panel of D.C. elected officials that American democracy was incomplete, that the emperor did not have all of his clothes, and that we were all there to help him gather some.

Our country certainly has been spreading the textile of democracy

around the world from the Soviet Union to southern Africa. A virtual tapestry of democracy has been woven from one shore to another as we have demanded from other countries that they give their citizens full democratic rights, never mind the hardships or traditions of current governments.

Well, America, there is an embarrassing hole in the American garment, and the tear begins right at this very spot: 600,000 people, most of them persons of color, have no voting representation in either the House or the Senate. It is a loose thread in the American tapestry. You must help us with the repair.

We pay more taxes per capita than 49 States. We were fifth per capita in troops in the Persian Gulf. We sent \$2 billion to the Federal Treasury last year.

Madam Speaker, democratic rights do not have to be earned in a democracy; nevertheless, we have done the heavy lifting. Please help us to lift this burden. Help us in the District of Columbia to become the 51st State.

Mr. ESPY. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and colleague from a neighboring State, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], who has served in Congress with distinction and who serves on, some feel, the most important committee in this Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I really appreciate this time to address the House on the state of the Union, on the crises of health and welfare in black America.

As you well know, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], will really address the health care state of the Union of black America.

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America states that the Federal Government will provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for our posterity.

President Bush has kept one part of the bargain by providing our Nation with a strong defense. But what has happened to the general welfare? What has happened to our poor, our weak, our needy?

An overhaul of the welfare system is long overdue. The current welfare system fails to address many of the recognized causes of poverty, inadequate health care, unemployment, day care, as well as teenage pregnancy.

We know that this Congress, both Houses of Congress, passed a welfare reform package some 2½ years ago and which was signed into law. We made significant gains in that package itself.

We know that in 19 States, fathers were put out of the household if the children were to receive welfare benefits. We know that welfare mothers had

no child care benefits available, and we were able to come in this Congress, not this session of Congress, but some 2 or 3 years ago, to pass that legislation.

The most pressing of these problems facing African-Americans today is the lack of adequate health care. Americans are living in an age of high-technology medicine; doctors are performing multiple organ transplants, and women over 40 are giving birth to healthy babies. Yet thousands of Americans, most of them African-Americans, are dying needlessly of diseases that our medical establishment learned to prevent or cure decades ago. As we approach the year 2000, the health of African-Americans is reminiscent of the 1940's, hospitals were segregated and flu shots a thing of the future.

The number of deaths from preventable illnesses is at an all time high. The lack of progress in providing African-Americans affordable health care is one of our Nation's most pressing problems and one of the greatest challenges facing us as policymakers in this Congress.

We challenge the administration to send forth to this Congress adequate health care legislation that will respond to the needy and African-Americans in this country.

Poverty, inadequate health care access, and inferior treatment combine to discourage many blacks from seeking any type of health care until it is too late. But the root of the problem lies in the lack of money for basic health care and other welfare programs.

The Government needs to put more of an effort into bridging the gap between the level of health care provided to African-Americans and those non-African-Americans. The answers appear to lie in improving domestic programs in our welfare system.

Oftentimes, people talk about welfare and people who do not want to work and people being lazy. That is not true. Even this recession that we are in and confronted with today tells us that because of the recession the welfare rolls will continue to grow, and until we address many of the domestic problems, we will continue to see them grow.

Rather than taking responsibility for helping the poor, our society far too often blames its victims for their impoverished condition. The attitude is embodied by the rationalization that the poor do not deserve compassion and do not need relief. But it is clear that poverty is not a chosen condition by a group of people in our society.

The current welfare system fails to address many issues, but it fails to address the issue of providing adequate domestic programs which is one of those affecting those who we know in African-American communities more so than in other communities, and unless we work together as African-Americans and policymakers to start mak-

ing health care a national priority, we will continue to provide things that we do not need, death and illnesses among our people in America.

It is time that we realize and recognize that we must make welfare reform our greatest legislative priority to respond to the downtrodden of this Nation, because as we look back and reflect, regardless of what color you might be, when that unemployment strikes you or members of your family, we must realize that we are only two or three paychecks away from the welfare rolls.

Mr. ESPY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee for his statement, for his eloquence, for his passion, and for his intensity.

Let us just suggest within the RECORD that it is OK to want to lift others up by their bootstraps and prod them to do it themselves, but there are so many, Madam Speaker, who have no boots at all, who have no shoes.

Madam Speaker, we turn now to the dean of the House, the dean of the Congressional Black Caucus within the House, one who distinguished himself not only by terms of service but who has distinguished himself without a doubt in leadership. Whenever anyone across the country needs an expert in civil rights, an expert to advocate in the interests of minority rights, individual rights, an expert in government waste, whether it is fraud and abuse, one only has to look to Congressman JOHN CONYERS from the great State of Michigan, who serves as chairman of a full committee here, chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, and chairman of a Judiciary subcommittee; we turn now to our dean, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

□ 1730

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, it has become commonplace today to say that the state of America for African-Americans is deplorable. One need not even be cerebral about it with statistical references. Simply look around the streets of this Capital City to see the joblessness, lack of housing, drugs, incarceration rates as high as South Africa, and lack of hope.

As a matter of fact, you can look around any city in America and see the same thing.

Throughout the world today we are witnessing historic struggles to enhance and protect the human spirit and the notion of freedom and equality. There is a revolution of hope, of the notion of what is possible. But not here at home. Here at home we get excuses—excuses not to enact civil rights and jobs legislation. We are patronizingly told to excuse and support the

appointment of a superconservative Supreme Court nominee simply because he is an African-American.

In 1988, we had the ugly exploitation of racial division in the Presidential election campaign with Willie Horton. In 1990 and 1991 we have it with "Willie Quota," the phony claim that restoring 25 years of civil rights with a protective floor will create quotas. You cannot say "no blacks allowed" but if you come up with a standardized test or some other supposedly neutral ruse that achieves the same result, then racism can prevail.

I say to you the White House is out of touch with our national community.

We cannot forget where we have been or where we must go. Washington, DC, our capital, has not always led the change. It responded because Rosa Parks was tired of the injustice. It responded because Martin Luther King became a civil rights leader and a legislator as well. It took action in the streets before Brown versus Board of Education was really implemented.

This moment in history allows for new dreams. For the first time in modern history we can begin to imagine—perhaps to create a new world order. War can potentially be seen as obsolete. The enormous sums of national wealth and talent devoted to the arms race can be redirected to our cities and small towns, to hazardous waste sites and deteriorating rainforests, to educate, housing, and health care.

We need a new set of budget priorities which this Congressional Black Caucus has regularly presented in its alternative budget.

Over the past 8 years the wealthy have seen their tax rates drop from 70 percent to 28 percent. Military spending, however, has increased by 40 percent after inflation. Domestic programs have been cut by 19 percent. Stagnant wages, budget cuts, environmental degradation, no health care for one-seventh of our population, and the devastation of drugs in our cities is taking its toll. The racial gulf is as wide as it has been in 25 years. We need a civil rights bill and a Supreme Court justice that will advance, not turn back, real, not abstract, equal opportunity.

So the Congressional Black Caucus in its 21st year faces these challenges with a confidence and a determination that we shall overcome.

Mr. ESPY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Now we turn to the dean of the Ohio delegation, Congressman LOU STOKES, who serves as the chairman of another very important committee on this body, the Ethics Committee, but who for many areas serves on a committee even more important, and that is the money doling committee, the all-important Appropriations Committee.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] for this special order in recognition of the 21st Annual CBCF Legislative Weekend. I want to commend the chairman of the caucus, EDOLPHUS TOWNS, and the chairman of the CBC Foundation, ALAN WHEAT, for their leadership in organizing this year's program. I want to acknowledge the work of my colleague, MIKE ESPY, who as Chair of the dinner has put together a superb program.

It is also important that we recognize the thousands of individuals who take time each year to travel to Washington and take part in our legislative weekend. I particularly want to acknowledge the participation of members of the Congressional Black Caucus health braintrust, the braintrust for which I serve as chairman on behalf of the CBC. The individuals who comprise the health braintrust—prominent and expert medical practitioners, health educators, health administrators, students and consumers—have been the driving force behind much of what we as a caucus have been able to accomplish in health. With their input and support, the CBC has been able to ensure that health policy has focused on ensuring quality and affordable health care for minorities and the medically indigent.

In fact, Madam Speaker, the health braintrust has always been in the forefront—defying odds and expanding opportunities to improve the health status of African-Americans.

The health braintrust program this year continues our mission of improved health for minorities. Our success in accomplishing this goal is a primary determinant of the future and the quality of life for African-Americans.

Madam Speaker, the health of African-Americans is in crisis. The magnitude and seriousness of this crisis have been documented and reported substantially in recent years. From these reports, we find that blacks and other minorities suffer an estimated 60,000 excess deaths annually. This, in a Nation where Federal health dollars are second only to the military budget; where—despite tremendous advances in medicine in the United States and the significant improvements in our Nation's health status—millions of African-Americans do not benefit fully or equitably from these advances. Thus, we have a situation where the status of health in minority communities is that of a third world nation.

There is a large segment of our community that has been abandoned to suffer high infant mortality rates, shortened life expectancy, a crushing burden of illness, debilitating poverty, disability and disillusionment, frustration and loss of hope. In recent years, these problems have been exacerbated by an unprecedented increase in violence, substance abuse, infectious dis-

eases such as AIDS, and greater numbers of uninsured persons.

In this regard, the CBC health braintrust focuses its attention this year on two issues confronting our community: violence and health care reform.

Madam Speaker, as you may know, Americans are dying from unnecessary violent death in unprecedented numbers. Daily, one hears accounts of drive-by shootings, tragedies in our schools, domestic violence, and other atrocities destroying lives. This grave situation is even more prevalent in African-American communities.

For young African-American men, in particular, death by homicide is a unique and cruel phenomenon. The Centers for Disease Control [CDC] reports that nationally 1 of every 1,000 young African-American males is murdered each year. No other ethnic group in the U.S. population even approaches this rate.

Homicide was the 10th leading cause of death in the United States last year, and is the leading cause of death among black men aged 15 to 44. For men aged 25 to 34, the black homicide rate is seven times that of whites. To put it another way, black males have a lifetime chance of 1 in 21 of dying by homicide, compared to 1 in 131 for white males. This disparity is also reflected among black women who have a lifetime risk of violent death of 1 in 104 compared to 1 in 369 for white women.

As a result of this phenomenon, violent death has become a public health problem. In conjunction with the Office of Minority Health and the Centers for Disease Control, the health braintrust has assembled a panel of national experts who will examine the many complex elements of violence. It is our hope that from these discussions will evolve some strategies to eradicate this serious problem.

Madam Speaker, the afternoon session of the health braintrust centers on the pressing issue of health care reform. This issue, as you know, is one of the most important policy challenges confronting Congress. My CBC colleague, JOHN CONYERS, joins me in hosting this hearing. As chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Congressman CONYERS has scrutinized our Nation's health care system, comparing it to the Canadian system, considering the consequences for both health care spending and access in the United States. Because of his work in this area, I am pleased that he is joining the health braintrust in this year's deliberations.

Because African-Americans and other minorities represent a disproportionate number of the uninsured in this Nation, it is crucial that we address these particular needs as part of the health care reform debate. As you may know, blacks and Hispanics have accounted for 55 percent of the increase in the

number of Americans added to the rolls of the uninsured between 1977 and 1987. They are also disproportionately represented in the kinds of families at the greatest risk of being uninsured—families where no one is working and families that are poor.

These startling statistics, coupled with the health status disparity between black and white Americans, demand immediate focus on health care reform for minorities. Prominent national African-American organizations will present their views on major health care reform proposals and make recommendations on strategies that address minority health care. This discussion will help in the development of a health care reform proposal focusing specifically on minority health.

Madam Speaker, while the health braintrust devotes this time to these pressing health issues, much remains to be done to improve the health of African-Americans. National attention has centered too much around the issues of costs containment and the growing budget deficit, instead of caring about extending adequate health care to all individuals as opposed to the privileged among us and alleviating the enormous burdens.

Our Nation must come to grips with the fact that a strong and productive society will not be realized and maintained if we do not ensure a healthy future for minority Americans.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of the position the Congressional Black Caucus has taken throughout the years advocating quality and affordable health care for all Americans. We are firmly committed to ensuring this right for all citizens and look forward to the health braintrust discussions guiding our deliberations in this respect.

Again, I welcome our guests to the 21st Annual CBCF Legislative Weekend and commend my colleagues for their leadership during this occasion.

□ 1740

In closing, Madam Speaker, let me just thank the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for the opportunity, the pleasure, and honor I have had over the last 23 years of associating with them in this great endeavor on behalf of African-Americans throughout our country. It is indeed an honor to be a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to close this critical assessment of the state of the Union and black America.

We stand, today, at the helm of the world's greatest democratic vessel. And yet, on our watch and despite the valiant battles waged by Members here assembled, we have witnessed the selective enrichment of the few and the deteriorating quality of life of the many. For those in the Congress, our friends and colleagues here today, and those whose interests we seek to protect both in this Nation and around the world—we have painted for

you a graphic picture. The Ship of State is awash by a tide of ill will that has divided our people—rich from poor, black from white, hopeful from hopeless. The thousand points of light have not illumined the dark corners which hide and blot out the ambitions and aspirations of the children of the ghettos and barrios of our Nation—they do not lift up those who lie down on the grates of city streets in the shadow of the White House and Wall Street.

Something must be done. Recent public policies and private actions have resulted in a massive increase in those with no health care, an American education system in crumbles, the erosion of American industry in the world arena, and the virtual devastation of the Nation's moral fiber. Racist and other socially destructive behavior, once denounced, have had their licenses renewed.

The fact remains, how we will be viewed in the future depends principally on how we deal with these problems today. As defense and war expenditures have exploded, basic domestic programs important to all our citizens have come under increasing attack. The American people are told that the budget deficit is so great that we can no longer afford to take care of our own.

What then has America become? Is it the machines of war, the factories, the fields and forests? No, America is fundamentally its people. And if we do not take care of the people, all of the people, this country will fail. If we can not afford to take care of each other, we can afford nothing at all. It is that simple.

If we do not assure the health of our work force, its work will be substandard. If we do not educate our people to the emergent world industrial standard, they will not be employable, and industry can not expand. If we do not invest in the economic survival of those who are temporarily or permanently unemployed so that their children can compete, we will have to support them, or worse, leave them by the wayside to perish. And if we do not take care of our senior citizens, who have sustained and nurtured us in our youth, we will have grievously insulted a rich legacy that is both American and African-American.

There may be a large budget deficit, but the moral and social deficits evident in our collective condition are far more threatening to the future of this country. Look around us: Our resources are abundant, our productive capacity enormous. Surely we can find a way in all this to take care of each other.

Mr. Speaker, since its founding more than 20 years ago, the Congressional Black Caucus and our coalition within the House and Senate have demanded the highest level of public service, equality of opportunity, and the maintenance of an economic democracy for national survival. We ask now that we step beyond partisan boundaries to open new doors for the dispossessed and rekindle the bright flame of competitiveness and pride in the work ethic. We ask of our colleagues and those within the sound of our voices to pledge, this day, to bring about a new state of the Union. That we who are a part of each branch of Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—reset the cornerstone of a democracy that is indisputably—of the people, by the people, and for the people.

STATE OF THE UNION AND BLACK AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WALTERS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus for this special order to discuss the state of the Union and black America.

I am here today because America is in grave danger, not just black America, but this entire Nation. The distinction, of course, is that when America is in danger, black and other minorities suffer in much greater numbers. As the only former international vice president of a labor union serving in the Congress, I have some particular concerns about the economy and the labor trends in this country. Blacks are truly suffering because of the policies of the Reagan-Bush era.

The trends suggest disturbing realities for many of America's children and families. The number of children in poverty continues to grow, with children having become the poorest age group of all Americans. Increasingly, full-time employment—even of both parents—is not enough to keep families and their children out of poverty. Not only does this administration ignore the domestic needs of this country, it makes it nearly impossible for working Americans to lift themselves out of poverty.

The current rising unemployment level leaves only about 56 percent of all working age African Americans employed. African-American workers still experience 2.4 times the unemployment of their white counterparts. It is even more outrageous for our younger African Americans who are greatly suffering. The facts are obviously directly related to the economic and social policies of the current Bush administration. Fiscal policies affect economic growth and stability; they determine how readily workers can find jobs.

Obviously this country can find dollars to help so-called emerging democracies because a deliberate choice is made—the priority is determined. This Nation—black people—are suffering, and I would contend that the southside of Chicago, Harlem, Detroit, the Mississippi Delta, and many other centers, are emerging democracies and need assistance for a new world order right here at home. The old adage that charity begins at home and then spreads abroad is clearly appropriate, but I would add that democracy, too, begins at home.

I have said it before, and will say it again. We may have to again take to

the streets to gain the attention of this administration. People are jobless, homeless, hungry and, yes, dying and this administration's response is that "the recession will be over soon." The Government is to be accountable to the people, but often the people have to demand such compliance. Black people—yes, all people—need a national jobs program now.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution to these proceedings.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of New York. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank also the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], chairman of this year's Congressional Black Caucus dinner, and to say how very much I appreciate the innovative and very practical addition of this special order on the state of the Union and black America.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about education, and I would like to begin by holding up a copy of a little red book. The little red book used to be associated with Mao Tse Tung in China. Now the red little book being circulated all over America is a copy of "America 2000: An Education Strategy of the Bush Administration."

This is one of the most dangerous documents in America. It is dangerous for all Americans who want to have the education system transformed. But it is particularly dangerous for African-Americans. This book totally leaves out African-Americans. It treats them with benign neglect, hostile neglect, total abandonment. The reason the Federal Government got involved in education at the elementary and secondary levels originally was to promote equality of educational opportunity, to focus on the disadvantaged, the poor. This is a representation of a total retreat of the Federal Government from that mission.

They have proposed to transform our schools without spending any money. It is a very misguided notion, a dangerous notion.

They are quite satisfied to have two systems in America, two school systems; one they are going to try to make world-class system, suburban schools in the richer districts; the other they are going to abandon completely. They are not going to treat at all the problems faced by the schools attended by the majority of African-American children.

In our big cities, Chicago, New York, Detroit, Los Angeles, the schools have been faced recently with devastating budget cuts, retrogression and complete deterioration has set in at a more rapid rate as a result of budget cuts which have wiped out gains that were being made slowly over the last few years.

Reading scores were going up, the dropout rate was going down; we had after-school centers in New York, a number of things that were positive; the ratio of pupils to teachers was going down. All of that has been wiped out by the recent set of budget cuts. Now in most of the big cities where our children attend school, they are proposing additional budget cuts. Only the Federal Government has the resources to come to the aid of the cities. Yet, none of that is being proposed.

America 2000 totally ignores the problem. That is the Republican strategy, this is a public-relations, Madison Avenue package that is gaining a large amount of acceptance across America. One of the reasons it is gaining wide acceptance is because it is the only ballgame in town. The Democratic Party has no strategy at all. Nothing is being offered by the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party continues to offer bright ideas from various leaders; we have a number of good bills being introduced relating to education, but the party has not put together a strategy; the party does not understand the modern needs, the salesmanship involved in the issues and therefore the Republicans have the field all to themselves.

America 2000 does not propose to help our children. We must propose and we must fight for our own strategy.

□ 1750

We must propose it, and, in order to do that at this 21st legislative week-end, the Congressional Black Caucus education brain trust has launched a group called the National Citizens Commission on African American Education. Over the past few years we have been frustrated by discussions that are held here once a year on the weekend, and then there is no followup. We have asked for the creation of a Citizens Commission on African American Education, and we have launched it. We have a chairman, Dr. Wilbert Lemelle, who is the president of the Phelps Stokes Fund who would be the chairman of this commission. Some very bright and dedicated scholars from all over America are part of it. Parents, students, a great cross-section. It is going to be a committee of 100 with an executive committee of no less than 25 people and they will launch the commission tomorrow at 12:30 with a press conference to issue the first communique and the first guidance.

We are going to issue communiques which address the decisionmaking official world of government. We want to have an impact on Government policies. We are not going to try to do it all ourselves. We insist that our Government spend the money that is necessary, that our Government takes the steps that are necessary. We also will issue guidances to the African-American community directing the African-

American community on how to mobilize best to deal with the problem internally on problems of marshaling resources, and we insist that we make education a priority. This is an organization that will force us to keep education as a priority. Everybody subscribes to that notion that education is the kingpin issue. It is the means toward which we achieve most of the ends, but sometimes other things get in the way.

For African-American children we need world-class schools before we subject them to a national testing program, as proposed by the Bush administration where world-class standards will be used, and they will be forced to meet those world-class standards although they have not gone to schools with proper teachers, laboratories, and other facilities. There are savaging inequalities that exist in our system, and these savage inequalities must be addressed by any honest effort to reform and improve the schools of America.

In New York State one school district spends more than \$13,000 per pupil while New York City spends \$5,000 per pupil, and even within the New York City area each school is not spending \$5,000 per pupil. Some schools, most of those in the African-American communities, are spending \$3,000 or less per pupil.

We cannot wait until the year 2000 to take meaningful action for our children. More budget cuts in the State and school district budgets means continuing deterioration and retrogression. We must act now to save African-American children.

What I say about New York is true of Detroit, Los Angeles, Chicago, and right across. We must have immediate appropriation, immediate appropriation of no less than \$1 billion. That is one-third the cost of one aircraft carrier. This \$1 billion should go to a hundred poor school districts for emergency items like books, laboratories, et cetera.

We should go further than that, appropriate \$230 million, which is the amount of money the Bush administration proposes just to launch choice, to deal with choice schools across America. They propose \$230 million. We insisted they match that \$230 million for a fund which would bring relief to America's poorest schools by establishing an institute for the education of at-risk students, a district education agent program to provide technical assistance to our schools and funds for experimental schools in our district, and, beyond that, when the budget agreement, that awful budget agreement we are now bound by, is up, we insist that there be permanent, nationwide relief appropriated: No less than \$3 billion, the cost of one aircraft carrier, for a Federal education revenue-sharing program, a revenue-sharing program to bring relief to the systems

that are now instituted in those devastating budget cuts.

At this point I enter three documents into the RECORD. One is National Citizens Commission on African American Education, Vision and Purpose Statement. I also would like to enter into the RECORD in its entirety the first national public policy education communique of the National Citizens Commission on African American education entitled "Emergency Action to Prevent Retrogression and Collapse." I would also like to enter the first National Citizens Commission on African American Education guidance to the African-American community. It is entitled "Emergency Mobilization for Education: the Basic Steps Which must be Taken by African American Communities."

NATIONAL CITIZENS COMMISSION ON AFRICAN-AMERICAN EDUCATION—VISION AND PURPOSE STATEMENT

Education is the major means by which all worthwhile ends in our complex, modern society are realized. Education is the kingpin issue, the first domino which impacts on all of the others. As it is for all other groups, education is critical for the survival of the African-American community. There is an urgent need for the establishment of a body which focuses continually and permanently on the national issues and policies related to education. This is a matter which is too important to be treated as one of several priorities. To speak for the African-American community a voice, an instrument, an organization is needed which commands respect and enjoys unchallenged credibility. The *National Citizens Commission On African-American Education* will assume this vital obligation.

Representing professional educators, teachers, parents, students, civil rights leaders, church leaders, civic and fraternal leaders, school board members, business persons and other segments of the African-American community, the Commission will be a Committee of 100 persons who have made an impact on education beyond their local communities; and persons who possess the knowledge and experience necessary to make critical judgments concerning existing national education policies or the knowledge and experience necessary to propose creative alternatives. The Commission seeks to accomplish two basic objectives:

To provide a critical review of existing national education policies; and to offer alternative national education policies and strategies for the benefit of African-American children and communities.

To provide national guidance to the African-American community for educational policies, strategies, programs and practical activities; to stimulate mobilizations for education in African-American communities all over America.

What is good for African-American children and students is good for all American children and students. The first concern of the Commission is a national education policy which used the abundant and unique resources of America to support a system which maximizes, nurtures children, and maximizes effective instruction, and training, and educational opportunities for all American youth. The Commission will speak from the perspective of the experts, practitioners and participants who are striving to

overcome the greatest battery of social, economic and political obstacles to learning and educational improvement. "What works" for the children and students whose problems we are most familiar with will work for all children and students.

While we recognize that education is traditionally primarily a local matter, we also fully realize that there are some vital educational tasks which the government of the United States must undertake. National federal participation in the decision-making and operations of our educational institutions may be quantitatively less than that of state and local government, but it is no less important. Indeed, this Commission maintains that only the continuous and vigorous involvement of the federal government can transform our schools and achieve the capability necessary to educate our children.

In addition to serving as a critical review agent for national policy, this Commission will conduct an exhaustive and caustic review of the support systems for education within African-American organizations and communities throughout the nation. By now it should be crystal clear to all that African-Americans will not survive in this global, modern, competitive society without maximizing the education effort for African-American children and students. Parents and families who fail to treat education as an item which is just as important as food, clothing and shelter must be deemed guilty of child neglect.

Every African-American community must be transformed into a "Learning Community" saturated with activities which encourage and support the education of adults and workers as well as children. Where necessary, the Commission insists that African-Americans take responsibility for changes in organizational habits, group mores, family and individual life-styles and changes in other conventional behavior in order to raise the level of awareness and increase the intensity of commitment to educational improvements and the enhancement of opportunities for youth within the African-American communities.

EMERGENCY ACTION TO PREVENT RETROGRESSION AND COLLAPSE

While the Commission applauds the presentation of a White House initiated comprehensive strategy for the improvement of education in America, we must hasten to expose the fact that *America 2000* fails to include a critically important chapter. Missing from this cleverly arranged scenario is a section entitled: *For Today's Students: Emergency Action To Prevent Retrogression and Collapse*.

Even before the economic decline and recession began to escalate, the budgets for public school systems serving the majority of the children of America were in a state of desperate stagnation or ruinous reduction. Deep state and local budget cuts have now further mutilated these local education agencies to the point where basic operations can not be maintained. The original beneficiaries of federal aid to elementary and secondary education—the poor, disadvantaged and students with disabilities—are served primarily by these inadequately financed systems.

The refusal of *America 2000* to advocate immediate relief for these schools struggling under the threat of disintegration represents an abandonment of the original and traditional mission of federal assistance. We deplore this failure of *America 2000* to confront this clear and present danger. Schools and students cannot be expected to meet "world

class standards" when their resources are being reduced to the primitive level of underdeveloped countries.

The Commission equally deplores the fact that there is no alternative to *America 2000* being offered by a congress controlled by Democrats. While we applaud individual pieces of legislation such as the *Urban Schools of America Act* and the *Institute for the Education of the At-Risk Act*, we wish to note that these specific components are poor substitutes for a well enunciated overall strategy. This balkanization or fragmentation of congressional legislation diminishes the possibility of success for these very worthwhile proposals.

There is a lack of options which must be corrected, a vacuum which must be filled. To address this unfortunate situation, the Commission is issuing a special appeal to the Democratic leadership of the Congress to prepare a comprehensive plan which includes proposals for emergency action. We shall also request that the Congressional Black Caucus prepare A Master-Plan for the Improvement of Education in America as an alternative to *America 2000*.

Until the component which we choose to label: *For Today's Students: Emergency Action to Prevent Retrogression And Collapse* is fully articulated, all comprehensive strategies proposed for educational improvement are at-risk of becoming cynical public relations gimmicks. If federal accountability is to be delayed until the year 2000, then the plan being discussed is irrelevant for the majority of our nation's students. While some of the best schools will be stimulated to become better as a result of adopting some of the actions proposed in *America 2000*, the majority of our nation's schools are presently not equipped to begin to participate.

Before "world class standards" and tests to measure compliance with such standards are imposed the federal government must take steps to guarantee that every American student is attending a "world class school". At present most African-American Students are attending schools that are relatively primitive. Before any testing of African-American students commences, in order to enable sub-standard schools to move closer to comparability, the Commission demands that the following emergency actions be taken by the federal, state and local governments:

To slow the rapid hemorrhaging of the education effort in the poorest school districts, the federal government must appropriate, in this fiscal year 1992, one billion dollars (the cost of one nuclear submarine) to be distributed to the one hundred poorest Local Education Agencies (the agencies with the greatest number of students entitled to free school lunches). This allocation should be used only for non-recurring expenditures such as science laboratory equipment, other equipment for classroom instruction (typewriters, computers, etc.), books, instructional films and videos, emergency repair of facilities which are primarily used by pupils or parents.

To support a continuous long-term program for the revamping of schools in the one hundred poorest congressional districts, the federal government should allocate no less than 230 million dollars annually beginning in fiscal year 1993. These funds would be utilized to support an Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students; to fund a District Education Agent Program which establishes a federal resource and technical assistance entity in each of the one hundred poorest districts; and to fund the launching of experimental new American schools in each of the one hundred poorest districts.

To provide permanent nation-wide relief no less than three billion dollars (the cost of one nuclear air-craft carrier) should be appropriated annually for a federal education revenue-sharing program. Such funds should be distributed on a per pupil basis with all Local Education Agencies eligible except those which do not have an enrollment with at least ten per cent of the pupils eligible for the federal free lunch program.

Federal legislation must prohibit the allocation of federal funds to any state which fails to distribute its state education assistance funds on an equal per capita or per pupil basis to all of the state's Local Education Agencies. The use of trick formulas which calculate aid on the basis of attendance instead of enrollment—and thus discriminate against the school districts with the poorest families—must be discontinued.

Federal legislation must prohibit the allocation of federal funds to Local Education Agencies which fail to distribute their basic operating funds on an equal per pupil per school basis thus assuring that all schools under the LEA's jurisdiction have comparable qualified personnel, facilities, equipment and other resources regardless of the race or income level of the student body.

State and local legislators as well as chief executives must mandate that Local Education Agencies maintain an effort at the level of tax support which existed as of December 1990, prohibit any state or local percentage reduction for education which are greater than those for the overall budget; establish a uniform floor for per pupil expenditures in order to provide an "adequate" or "minimum" education effort and mandate that expenditures be maintained at this floor level or above.

These are minimum emergency actions which must be taken to prevent retrogression and collapse in the public schools serving African-American and other at-risk children. Today's schools and students deserve a level of government support which guarantees the basics in terms of qualified teachers, safe and pleasant physical facilities, adequate books, equipment and supplies. The Commission looks forward to participation in the establishment of "world class schools"; however, failure to take immediate action would mean a loss of education opportunity for another generation. Further delay would also mean that the process of creating "world class schools" in African-American Communities would have to start from a set of skeletons and ruins.

To "promote the general welfare" is one of the most important constitutional obligations of the federal government. In modern societies the "general welfare" is greatly endangered when the populace is not adequately educated. Funds must be found to provide adequate educational opportunities for all. If necessary take education expenditures "off budget" or assign them their rightful place as a vital part of national security and place them in the same category as the defense budget. Let all defense savings yield an "education dividend".

We can not wait until the year 2000. Emergency education action is necessary now in the year 1991.

EMERGENCY MOBILIZATION FOR EDUCATION: BASIC STEPS

For African-Americans the next ten years will be decisive ones economically, politically and socially. The driving force which will determine progress in all three of these areas is education. In the African-American community a desperate effort to overcome

monumental obstacles is necessary and education is the instrument, the tool, the vehicle for this exodus out of the valley of chaos and calamity.

The first duty of every African-American leader and all community based institutions must be the application of maximum continuous pressure on federal, state and city government to achieve public policy changes which will transform education in our communities. A masterful guide providing one approach to the systematic application of such pressure is the *Blue Print of the National Conference For the Education of Black Children*.

Beyond this vital necessity of agitating for the greater and more relevant use of taxpayer provided resources to improve the education of African-American students, we must mount an "overwhelming crusade" within our communities. Every entity must aggressively seek ways to create an atmosphere for intellectual development and an environment for learning. We must strive to create "learning communities" and "neighborhoods of students".

Every community organization or institution must emphasize the fact that education is for all age groups and must consciously work to provide highly visible profiles of adults who are continuing their education. Every community entity must seek ways to positively influence youth peer groups. Every entity must act immediately to take an education census of itself.

Every group of persons within the African-American community—mothers, students and laymen as well as ministers, mayors, congresspersons, city and state legislators—must conduct an education census of the time, energy, income and other activities being utilized for, and dedicated to, education. All groups—churches, lodges, fraternities, social clubs, business and professional organizations—must conduct an education census to take stock, more must immediately follow this census. Because education is the salvation of our people we must not equivocate or hesitate to fully commit our resources or ourselves. To create the momentum needed to transform African-American communities into "learning communities" and "neighborhoods of students" we must all resolve to give money, know-how, energy and time until its hurts.

Every congressman must set aside a portion of his/her budget, staff, schedule, etc. in Washington and in the district for activities supporting education. The Congressional Black Caucus should escalate the pressure on the administration and the congress to obtain immediate meaningful appropriations to provide emergency relief to the schools serving African-American communities which are desperately in need. The CBC should also provide leadership for all other elected officials by developing an alternative comprehensive plan for the improvement of education in America. The CBC should foster special consultations with state and local African-American elected officials in order to gain and maintain support for the implementation of a relevant education master-plan.

All local and state legislators serving African-American communities should put forth a distinct set of positions and plans for the drastic overhaul of education in their jurisdictions. Trick state aid allocation formulas (such as those based on attendance instead of per capita or enrollment) must be confronted and liquidated. Local Education Agencies must be mandated to distribute funds and other resources on a per pupil equal basis to all schools except where special populations

are targeted by special projects or specific laws. Funds for personal services must also be distributed on a per pupil equal basis in order to insure that all children receive the benefit of experienced administrators and are exposed to tenured teachers with college majors in the subjects they are teaching. Requirements that all schools meet basic standards for licensed teachers, accredited libraries and certified science facilities must be established and enforced.

All mayors and county administrators must recognize the urgency and desperation of the present education situation with respect to African-American children, and they must utilize their high visibility and their executive powers to exert maximum influence on school boards and school administrators in order to achieve rapid, positive change in schools serving African-American children. It is the duty of African-American elected executives to, at all times, especially during periods of unavoidable budget reductions, serve as special guardians to protect the resources available for the education of our children.

All ministers and church leaders must resolve to more emphatically utilize the exalted position of the church in the African-American community to encourage education related activities. Every church should strive to establish and maintain a church library which includes African-American heritage books, videos and other educational materials. Church activities for youth should include spelling bees, oratorical contests, essay contests, heritage quizzes, debating clubs and other similar programs.

Every professional group should develop specific plans for the utilization of their know-how in support of the overall community education effort. Lists of professionals with summaries of their expertise and experience should be made available to local schools. Instead of waiting to be solicited by school officials, an aggressive visiting program should be initiated.

All business groups should resolve to assume responsibility for assisting with the development and monitoring of education and job training programs which are not under the jurisdiction of the school systems. In addition to continuing their traditional support for education—scholarships, awards, prizes, etc.—business groups should assume special responsibilities for the provision of resources for adults and workers.

All other religious, fraternal and social groups, should move beyond their traditional token support of education with a few annual scholarships and launch efforts to greatly expand such support by mobilizing other community groups and/or by demanding greater support from corporations and other suppliers of goods and services to the African-American community.

Public libraries and librarians must be viewed as a free-standing community resource available to be utilized by all segments of the community in the process of mobilizing to improve education. Elected officials, clergy leaders, businesspersons, professionals, parents, students and all others may come together at this taxpayer supported facility. An information data-base for education can be maintained at a local library; a directory of professionals volunteering expertise and businessmen volunteering resources may also be maintained. Public libraries should be utilized as headquarters for community-wide education improvement committees.

America 2000 Communities as designated in the President's strategy, America 2000, rep-

represent a desirable approach to organizing for educational improvements at the level of the congressional districts. All African-American communities are urged to participate in the processes to establish *America 2000* by adopting the six National Educational Goals, bringing together a cross-section of community leaders to set up report cards to monitor the local achievement of such goals and completing the additional necessary steps.

The current state of education in African-American communities clearly indicates that not only have we been victimized by negative and destructive public policies, we have, as a people, also acquiesced to the rampant anti-intellectualism, anti-education mind-set of mainstream America. In order to survive African-Americans must desert the ideology of consumerism and seek higher ground. We must spend most of our limited discretionary incomes and most of our bountiful supplies of time and energy on the education of our children and ourselves. Survival demands nothing less than the fullest possible commitment. We must mount the "overwhelming crusade" for education which creates "learning communities" and "neighborhoods of students".

From this moment and until the year 2000, African-Americans must march up front; in education African-Americans must set the pace, provide the leadership, for mainstream America.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I want to say that this is a struggle that must be entered with the same kind of total commitment that we had during the civil rights struggle. Our children will become obsolete drones in the 21st century labor market if we do not use every resource at our command to guarantee that they get a first-class education. Only we will do it, be able to do it. We must begin the struggle now.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for his contribution to these proceedings and would now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for yielding. I also want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], for holding the first hour of this special order.

Madam Speaker, I rise to just say a few words about the status of civil rights in this country. Just a few months ago the news media reported that a study revealed that black Americans were three times as likely as whites to face job discrimination. That study, which was conducted by the Urban Institute, has offered strong evidence about the enduring condition of job discrimination against black Americans. The study reminds us that we, as a nation, have a long way to go to eliminate racial discrimination in the workplace and throughout this society.

Madam Speaker, too many of our brothers and sisters, thousands, millions, have been left out and left behind. Thirty years ago we saw the

President, a young and energetic President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We saw the U.S. Congress, and we saw the U.S. Supreme Court as a sympathetic referee in the struggle for civil rights. Today, 30 years later, this Nation is crying out for leadership on the issue of civil rights. It is not just black America, but all of America is crying out for moral leadership. It is a shame and a disgrace that in 1991 we are still debating whether or not we should protect our fellow Americans from discrimination.

Thirty years ago, Madam Speaker, I came to this city as a very young man, 21 years old, to begin an historic journey called the Freedom Rides. As we travelled throughout the Nation, from Washington, into Virginia, through North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, I saw those signs that said "white men," "colored men," "white women," "colored women," "white waiting," and "colored waiting." But I say to my colleagues, Madam Speaker, a large number of people around this Nation, black and white, young and old, rich and poor, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and many Members of this body had the moral courage to bring those signs down. Those signs are gone, and they will never return.

Madam Speaker, we won that battle, but our mission is not over. The fact is that almost 30 years after the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act the scars and the stains of racism are still deeply embedded in American society, and I just want to remind my colleagues that are maybe watching this procedure that during our last debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1991, we only said that this act was an attempt to take us back to where we were before the recent Supreme Court ruling. There was nothing radical, there was nothing extreme, there was nothing revolutionary about this little piece of legislation. I want to say once again that it was not one section, one paragraph, one sentence, not one word to suggest that this view was a quota view. For anyone to continue to suggest that the Civil Rights Act of 1991 had anything to do with quotas, was tampering with the truth and misleading the American people.

□ 1800

We still do not have a civil rights bill, and we need that bill now more than ever before. The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 will be good for all America.

Madam Speaker, we must continue to serve and to stress the fact, as we talk and speak about the state of black America, that we are one Nation, that we are one community, that we are one people, that we are one family, and that civil rights belongs to all of us.

Madam Speaker, again I want to thank my friend and colleague, the

gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for yielding.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for his very compassionate and powerful contribution to these proceedings.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let me first congratulate the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the chairperson of the dinner, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], and the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT]. I think that these gentlemen have brought us through these times very nicely, and I would like to publicly acknowledge that without their dedication we would not be as far along as we are tonight.

Madam Speaker, as we gather tonight to assess the state of black America, let us remember that we have promises to keep. Promises that we have made to ourselves—to move forward, to remain strong, and most importantly, to be the guardians of the next generation—our children and youth.

At no time in our history have our young people faced the kind of danger they now encounter in their daily lives. In their neighborhoods, in their schools, and in their homes, it is all too often a perilous existence.

Childhood should be a time of joy, security, learning and growth. The bleak reality is that young children are more likely than any other group in our country to be poor. One in four preschool children live in poverty, and statistics indicate that African-American and Hispanic children are 2 to 3 times more likely than other children to be poor.

Changes in demographics are having a profound effect on African-American children. With the growth in the number of single mothers, day-care needs have reached the critical stage.

It is time that we recognize that we have a national crisis on our hands. We have a situation where over 38,000 infants in this country die before reaching their first birthday.

In many ways, we seem to be moving backwards—last year, more children died of a preventable disease, measles, than in any year since 1971.

In my home State of New Jersey, over 223,000 children lack medical coverage, and over 15,000 are homeless.

Nearly 300,000 children in New Jersey live in poverty.

Only 1 of every 5 children in New Jersey has access to a Head Start Program, and 10 of every 1,000 children

born in my State this year will die before their first birthday.

In my own congressional district, the 10th District of New Jersey, we are dealing with a life-and-death struggle as we try to help babies born with the AIDS virus. Newborns are inheriting the alcohol and substance abuse problems of their mothers.

Following a congressional hearing in my district on the problem of abandoned infants, I introduced legislation to help keep families together by giving them the resources they desperately need to overcome their problems. The House Education and Labor Committee recently passed the measure.

Madam Speaker, there are solutions. It is my firm belief that a Nation as great as ours can offer all children a bright future, if we have the will. Surely, if a military victory on foreign soil can be accomplished, a victory on behalf of America's children is possible.

The Rockefeller Commission has recently made a number of sound suggestions for improving the quality of life for our children and youth. Among these is a \$1,000 income tax credit for each child in America, which would help many families better cope with the financial burdens they now bear.

There are many creative and innovative approaches to helping our young people. Tomorrow, I will host a braintrust in conjunction with the Congressional Black Caucus legislative weekend on the topic, "Youth at Risk: Programs That Work."

A number of community activists and young people have generously agreed to share their success stories with us. In communities across the country, people are pulling together; they are forming community outreach and monitoring programs; they are giving young people an important message—that they matter, that we care.

Madam Speaker, let us reaffirm our commitment to the next generation. Let us keep our promise, because they represent the promise of the future.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] for his contribution to these proceedings.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I feel so proud of being an American, I am proud of being a member of this distinguished body, but I am even so much more proud to be a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Some 21 years ago I joined the Congress with the distinguished gentleman from California, and at that time, under the leadership of former Congressman Charles Diggs, we came together to form the Congressional Black

Caucus. That was 21 years ago, and in each session and each term the strong keeps getting stronger and we are able to return to this Congress, and I think, more than any other group here, we provide more protection for this Constitution and what this country is supposed to represent than any group that has served in this honorable body. There is no question in my mind that history is going to so record those facts, not because we have higher morality or because we have stronger convictions but because we have constituents who are the strongest and most patriotic Americans that this country has ever seen. They have fought on every battlefield from the cotton fields to our recent excursion to the Persian Gulf. Yet they believe in those principles of life, of liberty, and of the pursuit of happiness, and they have asked us not to do these things just for African-Americans but for all Americans, although somehow it appears as though the political structure has just bypassed us.

So there is no question, if we are talking about the homeless, the jobless, and the hopeless, that hope is found in our Congressional Black Caucus in all these areas.

□ 1810

Recently our President came to this House and asked a joint session to join with him in a war against drugs. No one applauds it more than I do, because, knowing the President's propensity to get involved in excursions in which he declares war, I had hoped that there would be a sense of sincerity here in having someone at the helm to be able to say that the real threat to our society is not the communists, but are those that have no hope, that cannot fulfill their dream that this country can produce for them. That is the only reason that anyone would give up their minds and bodies to drugs that preys on them.

But when the President indicated that his war was going to be conducted by a crime bill, one had to pause and wonder whether he understood what the problem was all about. We cannot win any war by taking the most productive part of our society, those that we expect to participate in making us more productive, that being the labor force that we are going to need to compete, and think that all we have to do is warehouse them in jails.

We cannot compete if all we are going to do is wait for some kid to drop out of school to be found homeless, to believe that he can find a better life in drugs than he can in seeking a higher education. We cannot help because we are able to lock him up.

A society that is willing to pay more to keep someone in jail than they are to keep them in school, a society that does not believe it is their responsibility to deal with the problems of the

homeless and the jobless, cannot win any war against drugs.

We fight this war with no chief of a joint staff to guide us, with no foreign policy to affect those nations that are creating and producing tons of coca leaves and cocaine and opium and heroin. We come with an Attorney General that has no plan to give any assistance to those who find that they may be on their way to jail for rehabilitation, so that they can come back into society and be productive.

We have no plan, no national strategy in terms of rehabilitation for those that have fallen. But, worse than anything else, Madam Speaker, we have no plan to give our youngsters an alternative to death on the installment plan by addicting themselves to drugs.

Our hospitals, our emergency wards, are swollen with children being born every day addicted to drugs, some with AIDS, abandoned sometimes by parents.

Our emergency wards find children who have killed other children, and others are wounded. Others suffer with hypertension, heart disease, liver failure, and kidney failure, all related to drug addiction.

I know that if we are going to win this struggle, and we will, it is going to take the programs as initiated by my beloved Congressional Black Caucus. It is going to take a Congress that is concerned about that Constitution and making certain that each and every individual in this country has the opportunity to succeed and be able to form that dream that the late prince of peace, Dr. Martin Luther King, talked about.

But you cannot form that dream in some shelter, living on the streets, or just squandering in some jail cell. We are going to have to make an investment to make certain if this great Nation of ours is going to remain competitive, if we are going to reduce our budget deficit, if we are going to bring some balance to trade, that we have to have a labor force that is going to be able to produce.

Madam Speaker, I tell you I am convinced that as soon as we get finished losing islands to invade and areas that we are bringing liberty to for dictators that never appreciated the qualities that we have evolved, at least in writing, in our Constitution, until we can decide we are more concerned with education than we are in creating a defense force when there is no one to fight, until we are willing to invest in our schools what we are willing to invest in building our jails, then we won't come anywhere near really reaching the high goals and ideals that are in this Constitution.

So as we move on to this 21st year, let me say to the new Members, that we have a challenge to present to this House, but we also have a responsibility to go in every county and every

city and every congressional district to see that our numbers get stronger. Because when the final pages of history are written, I am thoroughly convinced that it will say when all people were trying just to get reelected, it was the Congressional Black Caucus who stayed on that road that best protected our national security and the Constitution and moral values that America truly should and does believe in.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very powerful presentation.

Madam Speaker, I would now yield myself the balance of my time, as I understand the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], will follow with an additional hour and my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus who have not spoken will have an opportunity to speak during that one hour.

Madam Speaker, in making my contribution to these proceedings, I will look back, pause momentarily in the present, and also attempt to look prospectively.

Prior to making my remarks, I would like to first thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], for organizing these special orders, and feel very pleased and privileged to be part of it.

Second, Madam Speaker, I would say that it is always with a profound sense of pride that I stand with a group of people that I consider the most progressive and compassionate legislators in the United States. I have had the great privilege of serving with members of the Congressional Black Caucus now for nearly 21 years, faces now lined with gray hair and deep lines.

But over the course of that time, it has always been with a great sense of strength and pride that I rise with the Congressional Black Caucus, as we on numerous occasions have taken to the well, to challenge, to advocate, to inspire, to energize, indeed, to have the audacity to attempt to prevail, on behalf of our respective constituents. So I feel great pride in rising this afternoon.

I rise today to speak out on behalf of the poor and the powerless in our society, Madam Speaker, the young, the elderly, the physically disadvantaged, the single mothers striving against increasing odds to maintain the social fabric of the family, and the majority of our minorities who still suffer the tortures of discrimination and deprivation in the classroom, the workplace, among other places, and in their access to affordable housing and health care.

Madam Speaker, I speak out this afternoon with a combination of personal pain, persistent anger, political and professional commitment to intensify the struggle to secure social equity and economic justice for all in our society, regardless of race, national origin, religion, age, gender, economic condition, or political preference.

The pain and anger, Madam Speaker, have multiplied with each succeeding

year during the past decade, because of the disastrous short-term and long-term consequences of what came to be known as Reaganomics. Sadly, the Congress has been unwilling to stand up with courage and conviction to challenge the ascendant administration's philosophy of greed, selfishness, self-aggrandizement, by the privileged and the powerful, at the expense of America's middle class and working poor, the overwhelming but powerless majority of our citizens.

Ten years ago, after Mr. Reagan submitted his first budget to the Congress, I wrote the following analysis to my constituency in the eighth Congressional District in California. I quote in part:

The new administration's budget is the most flagrant systematic assault by government on the economic well-being of America's middle class, working poor, and unemployed, in this century. The proposed cuts from social service programs for the poor, the elderly, the unemployed and the handicapped, will be transferred directly to the Pentagon.

This is a deliberate escalation of the international arms race on which this administration plans to spend a minimum of \$1.3 trillion in the next 5 years. The administration's plan to stop runaway inflation and revitalize our economy will produce even greater budget deficits and more long-term unemployment than its Carter counterpart.

□ 1810

Tragically, Madam Speaker, those prophecies have become reality during the past decade. For those who refuse to believe, consider the following: During the Reagan-Bush era the tax rate for the highest income earners was decreased from 70 to 28 percent; the corporate tax rate for the largest corporations was reduced from 56 to 34 percent; the capital gains tax was reduced to 28 percent and the current administration is lobbying to have it reduced even further to 16 percent.

A decade ago the Dow Jones average of leading industrials was 954.01, the day after Reagan's inauguration. Yesterday it was 2,982.56. During the past decade the United States spent more than \$3 trillion on the military budget, \$2.958 trillion in budget authority, \$2.780 trillion in outlays, and foreign military assistance and transfer programs, \$118.44 million.

During the past decade the national debt has almost quadrupled. It is currently in excess of \$3.528 trillion. The projected budget deficit for fiscal year 1991 is \$279 billion; \$336 billion in fiscal year 1992, due in large part to the catastrophic nature of the S&L crisis and continued excessive military spending.

During the same decade the following fiscal, social, and economic injustices were inflicted on the American people: The total tax burden, including increased Social Security, State, and local taxes for middle class and working poor has actually increased almost a fifth. During the past decade revenue-

sharing and CETA funding were totally eliminated. During the past decade HUD-assisted housing programs and urban aid programs were both cut by more than 70 percent.

During the past decade, while the inflation rate rose more than 40 percent, cumulative food and nutrition assistance to the poor and needy increased less than 20 percent; the Food Stamp Program, less than 5 percent; elementary, secondary and vocational education assistance, less than 15 percent; higher education assistance, less than 12 percent; veterans' nonservice-connected pensions less than 2 percent.

During the past decade health care costs and insurance for middle class and working Americans have more than doubled. More than 37 million Americans currently have no health insurance whatsoever. On any given day that number is even astronomically beyond 37 million.

The United States and South Africa, very interesting juxtaposition, remain the only industrialized nations in the world without a national health insurance program. This explains in part, Madam Speaker, why the United States currently ranks—here is a superpower—ranks 21st in the world in terms of infant mortality and no longer is in the top 10 in terms of life longevity.

In 1979, the total unemployment rate was 5.9 percent. In 1980, in the wake of the second Arab oil boycott, it averaged 7 percent. In August of this year, 6.8 percent. For Black America the current crisis borders on the catastrophic.

Consider the following realities: In August of 1991, black unemployment was still double that of whites at 12.3 percent. For Hispanics, almost as grim, 9.9 percent. The latest official unemployment statistics for blacks, 39.7 percent, and Hispanics, 23.8 percent. Teenagers have increased from what they were a decade ago. They have almost tripled and doubled respectively the rate of their white teenage counterparts.

While white poverty fell marginally during the past decade, black poverty has significantly increased. More than one of every three blacks in America live in poverty or worse.

The current census projections of the black population—listen to this—the current projections of the census on the black population in America means that at this very moment there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 14 to 15 million black Americans living in poverty, living below the poverty level.

The number of blacks who are among the poorest of the poor, those who have income less than half of the official poverty level, has increased by almost 75 percent in the past decade. The poverty rate for black children is now hovering around 50 percent, the highest rate since the Great Depression, even worse for black children below the age of 6 years.

Black female heads of families are 4 times more likely to be poor as black married couple families. The ratio is even worse for families headed by women between the ages of 15 and 24. The poverty rate for blacks lacking a high school diploma exceeds 40 percent. The poverty rate for blacks with a high school diploma is four times as great as their white counterparts.

There are more black males, Madam Speaker—check this out—there are more black males between the ages of 18 and 25 incarcerated in America's prisons than in every single 4-year institution in this entire country, a nightmarish statistic with alarming implications for the present and the future.

Madam Speaker, homicides by guns, already alluded to by others, or other weapons are now the leading cause of death among black males from ages 16 to 25.

Madam Speaker, because of the fiscal and social horrors that I have just cited, and those are only a few to just paint a partial picture of the nightmarish realities that are the realities of the black condition in America, and because of the dramatic changes in the international security situation in recent months, I believe it is imperative, Madam Speaker, that the Congress take the lead in rethinking our national and international priorities and reordering our spending priorities, both at home and abroad.

During the past decade this group, the Congressional Black Caucus, has continually tried to address these critical issues in the context of a changed and changing world through the proposals contained in its annual quality-of-life budget, alternative budget proposals that clearly were visionary and forward-thinking, for we have the audacity to carve out a new role for this country in a rapidly changing world.

Now in the wake of the budget summit agreement last year and recent events, I and other concerned Members of the House are firmly convinced that we must now seize this historic moment to address these new realities in a constructive and enlightened manner. We must go beyond the limitations and the constraints of last year's agreement to forge new programs that address the challenges and crises of today and tomorrow. The world has changed.

If we are all telling the truth here, we are about the business of losing an entire generation of our children. This country does not look the same. It does not feel the same, and it does not smell the same. These realities combined mean that we must seize the moment to bring change.

Last year's budget resolution is an antiquated idea that has to go with the evolving and changing world. The Cold War and the Warsaw Pact and the Berlin Wall are history, and our national

security budget ought to accept and respond to these realities.

□ 1830

There will continue to be problems caused by the disintegration of the Soviet Empire and the reemergence of national ethnic and religious animosities, but these absolutely must be addressed within the context of the United Nations and collective security agreements. We cannot be the police officers to the world.

Old myths can no longer be utilized to justify the continued escalation of the nuclear and conventional arms race, nor further U.S. unilateral overt or covert intervention in Third World countries.

Accordingly, the Congress should give serious consideration to further responsible, orderly reduction in nuclear and conventional forces.

If these proposals that many of us are prepared to present, to debate, to advocate, and to push forward—if these proposals were adopted and implemented during the next 4 years, this Government could cut military spending from the current \$292 billion per annum to less than \$150 billion over the next 4 years. That is in constant 1992 dollars. This would result in budget savings of almost \$600 billion over the next 4 years.

It staggers the imagination to consider the extraordinary compassionate, innovative, and marvelous things we could do to make this world a better place for our children and our children's children with \$600 billion, not dedicated to ending life on this planet with the insanity and the absurdity of nuclear weapons and conventional forces that are obsolete, given the changing world.

As an initial commitment to the changed national and international priorities, Congress should take the first step by further reducing the military budget in fiscal 1992. I am quite aware that the budget summit agreement of 1990 provides that 50 percent of any reduction in the military budget must go to deficit reduction, but given the realities of the changing world and the human needs that are going to be neglected and that need to be reconsidered, that figure, it seems to me, is too high. I think we need to bring down the budget deficit, but 50 percent of the cuts, that is a figure I think we need to change. There are critical human needs that must be met in the year ahead if America is to endure as a compassionate nation.

Besides budget reduction, I propose that a portion of the reduction should be spent through international relief agencies to the former Soviet Republics most in need of food, energy, and health care assistance. An equal or greater amount should be directed through these same international relief agencies to the starving and displaced

millions of sub-Saharan Africa, because their needs are even greater and more acute. We indeed do have international responsibilities. I believe in the global responsibility. It is good politics, it is compassionate politics, it is a role that a major power like the United States should play.

However, I hasten to point out that I believe the overwhelming portion of these dollars should be promptly redirected back into the human needs, social services, educational programs there were cut by \$50 billion in last year's budget agreement. This should serve as a prelude or the basis for a new budget summit that will honestly deal with long-term solutions rather than short-term fiscal fig leaves.

The proper reordering of our national priorities will then enable us to work toward the rebuilding of our national infrastructure in order to make us more competitive in the new world marketplace. That in turn will necessitate the rehabilitation and revitalization of our inner cities and long overdue improvements of our mass transit systems, et cetera.

However, this can only be achieved by a massive commitment by the National Government to quality education programs at all levels, from preschool to professional school so as to provide the properly educated work force to meet the challenges of a new century.

This must be accompanied by massive but necessary outlays for substantive improvements in housing and health care. This commitment to education, to jobs, to housing, to health care must be made to all of our people, especially our minorities, particularly our constituency.

The bottom line reality is this: We will either pay now, Madam Speaker, or we will pay later, but we will pay. We must be willing to pay now to increase constructive educational and job opportunities for all of our youth, or we will pay later in the form of more racial and economic segregation, more taxes for more prisons, more police and, tragically, yes, more violence predicated upon class as well as race. It is time that we as a Nation give up to the promises and dreams inherent in the Declaration of Independence and indeed the Bill of Rights.

This Nation was founded as a representative democracy. For more than two centuries many of our forefathers, forebearers of all colors and both genders have struggled to make this a more inclusive society with increased opportunity for all. Now it is incumbent upon us to elect people to the Presidency and to the Congress who will respond to the needs and aspirations of all to make this a better society for our children and for our children's children.

We are at a critical crossroads in our historical future. We cannot afford to

step back or step away from the path of national purpose and collective effort that will help us achieve racial harmony and economic justice for all. I ask you assembled in this place and those not assembled in this place to join with us in making these dreams a new national reality.

As a final comment, Madam Speaker, I simply say again to my distinguished colleagues who comprise the Congressional Black Caucus, this has been my family for 21 years. We have fought here together, we have cried here together, we have felt pain, we have felt anger here together. But I am renewed and energized by our efforts today and the fact that I know that we will continue to struggle over the days ahead to continue to challenge this institution, and indeed this country to a more lofty place.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

STATE OF THE UNION AND BLACK AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], for convening us here today for this historic special order on the eve of the 21st anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus. Also my thanks to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for continuing the second hour of this very important debate. I, like many others, also seek time, but first, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Orleans, LA, Mr. JEFFERSON.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to participate in this special order on the state of black America. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for reserving this time for this important discussion.

While our Nation as a whole has undergone a serious international reassessment of its strengths and weaknesses to discover how it will compete in the year 2000 and beyond, black America has also undergone a reassessment of its status. Especially is this true in the area of higher education. Access to college for black Americans is less now than it was 10 years ago. College-going rates are down, and so are graduation rates.

□ 1840

To a large extent, the diagnosis and the prescription are the same for both America as a whole and for black America. Our Nation is at risk. Black America is at risk. For both, the cure is education.

Fortunately for black Americans, historically black colleges and univer-

sities have, since their creation in 1865, been a progressive and creative force in the vigorous pursuit of the achievement of social justice, cultural awareness, and academic excellence for black Americans. As a native son of the South where most black colleges and universities can be found and as a graduate of one of these outstanding institutions, I speak with personal knowledge about the significant role these colleges and universities play in educating and uplifting black Americans.

In no other region of the country has the impact of historically black colleges and universities been felt more directly than in the South. Mired, as it has been, in the depravity of its past injustices toward its black citizens, the South today shows strong signs of changed cultural and political landscapes and an increasingly enlightened appreciation for its rich diversity. This would not have been possible without black colleges and universities.

Madam Speaker, it is no accident that the South has the greatest number of black elected officials of any region in the country. Without fanfare and with meager resources, black colleges and universities have prepared overwhelming numbers of black lawyers, black doctors, military officers, and academics. As W.E.B. Du Bois described them, these colleges were practical enough to nurture black Americans in the enterprise of learning here on the Earth, yet able to point us to new horizons in the skies, wherever we aspire.

Historically black colleges, Madam Speaker, must be preserved. They must be strengthened. They must be enhanced so that they might continue their stellar contributions to the evolution of black Americans.

To this end, I, along with several other members of the Congressional Black Caucus and others of my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor, have introduced H.R. 3244, the College Opportunity Act of 1991. This act will better meet the needs of our Nation's historically black colleges and universities, to remove the barriers to higher education facing our African-American youth. It will strengthen and enhance historically black colleges, and it will improve the access and educational attainment of the students they serve.

In the Higher Education Act of 1965, Congress recognized the fundamental wisdom of bolstering historically black colleges and universities to help meet important goals for the Nation.

As we reauthorize this act in 1991, I believe that all Americans must recognize the progress of the Nation as a whole is inextricably bound to the educational progress of black Americans and that, indeed, Madam Speaker, breaking down barriers and building opportunities for black Americans is

building the strength and enhancing the competitiveness of all Americans.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Madam Speaker, let me, if I might, take a moment to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT], the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WHEAT. Madam Speaker, as I rise to participate in this critical assessment of the state of our Union and the state of black America, I could not help but take a few moments to pause and thank several who have come before for their contributions and their accomplishments.

One we think of, because as Members leave this well, they are on their way to a last reception for a colleague who is retiring for a higher calling, the majority whip of the House of Representatives, our colleague, Bill Gray, recognizing that there is an important task within this body, but that each of us has a role to play wherever it may be, and he goes on to become the president and the executive director of the United Negro College Fund. We applaud him and thank him for the 12 years that he gave us in this body.

I also want to take a moment to thank another colleague who is no longer with us, a colleague who left us 2 years ago on a mountaintop in Ethiopia, a colleague who came here with Bill Gray and who served steadfastly for 10 years in this Congress, our friend, Mickey Leland.

Mickey Leland believed that we had a mission as the Congressional Black Caucus in this Congress. Mickey pointed to the troubles that exist not just in this country but throughout the world. He pointed to the people that he loved best, the children of the world, and he pointed to one problem that exists for most of those children: The problem of hunger, accompanied by disease and oftentimes starvation. Mickey Leland said that hunger was a disease for which we all knew the cure, that if a child was hungry, that it had to be fed. Mickey reminded us that it was important to care for children everywhere, but more than that, he said it is not enough to care. We have to act.

And that is the mission of the Congressional Black Caucus, to act on the pressing issues and struggles of our day.

As I stand here and as all of us have stood here in this well, we have stood at the helm of the world's greatest democratic vessel, proud to be members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and, Madam Speaker, I might add that I am proud to know that people have journeyed to Washington, DC, to participate in this struggle, and as you pointed out, it makes us understand once again that there is a struggle worth fighting for.

Yet, even as we struggle on, despite the valiant battles waged by Members

who have been assembled here, we have witnessed the selective enrichment of the few and the continuing deteriorating quality of life for the many.

For those in the Congress, our friends and colleagues here today, and those whose interests we seek to protect both in this Nation and around the world, a graphic picture has been painted for you: A ship of state awash in an ill tide of evil will that has divided our people, rich from poor, black from white, and hopeful from hopeless.

Even here in Washington, DC, great people abound, and I do not mean great by any dint of accomplishment. I do not mean the people at the White House nor do I even mean the people in this body. I mean the people who sleep in the shadows of the White House, in the winter in Washington, DC, on the grates in the sidewalk because it is the only warm place they can find to lay their head.

The thousand points of light are not brilliant enough to reach into those shadows cast by the White House, and socially destructive behaviors like racism, once denounced in this country, have had their licenses renewed. And what do we hear from the White House in response? We are told that the American people can no longer afford to take care of their own, that our budget deficit is too great.

There may be a large budget deficit, but the moral and social deficits evident in our collective condition are far more threatening to the future of this country. Look around us, our resources are abundant. Our productive capacity is enormous. Surely we can find a way in all of this to care for each other.

□ 1850

As a people, I believe we are too caring to turn our backs on our fellow citizens in need. As a nation, the future holds great promise if we can but channel the tremendous reservoir of talent, energy, and resources that our country possesses.

This week we have a clear reminder of what our Government can be. As the hearings begin in the U.S. Senate on the nomination of a candidate to replace Justice Marshall on the High Court in this land, with the departure of Justice Marshall from the U.S. Supreme Court, a towering figure of the civil rights era is preparing to leave the scene. By using the judiciary as a tool for positive social change, he by himself perhaps did more than any other American in modern times to expand the rights of ordinary citizens.

The civil rights era launched by Thurgood Marshall, by Rosa Parks, by Martin Luther King, and other champions of justice was marked by the passage of landmark legislation banning discrimination in employment, in housing, in public accommodations, and the voting booth.

Our Government during those years became an instrument to change the

odds for the most vulnerable members of our society and to give them a vision of hope for the future.

Thanks to this watershed period in our Nation's recent past, an unprecedented number of black Americans are now economically secure. Yet, as you have heard from the colleagues today, recent events have shown us that we cannot take these gains for granted, or in the words of a former U.S. Senator from Louisiana who put it this way when he was asked to sum up the civil rights movement, he said, "You people"—and we know who he meant when he said "You people"—he said, "You people almost had it made, but you rested just too soon."

Well, Madam Speaker, there is an old African proverb that says, "Going slowly does not stop one from arriving."

We in the Congressional Black Caucus and you in this country have been on this journey for a very long time and this journey will continue until we arrive, but even now an increasingly hostile U.S. Supreme Court has begun to chip away at the underpinnings of our Nation's antibias safety net, and this administration has shown itself willing to play Willie Horton politics with legislative safeguards against discrimination.

In the face of the obstacles to progress, the Congressional Black Caucus will rise to the challenge of developing strategies to address the inequities that continues to confront our modern society and we will create new opportunities for an increasingly diverse African-American population.

President Bush has called for a new world order. We ask simply for the old American dream.

Today we ask of our colleagues and others within the sound of our voices to pledge to bring about a new state of the Union. We ask that those who are a part of each branch of Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, set the cornerstone of a democracy that is indisputably of, by and for all of the people of this great land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Does the gentleman request unanimous consent to strike references to the gallery from his remarks?

Mr. WHEAT. Madam Speaker, do I understand that it is against the rules of the House to refer to the people in the gallery?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is against the rules.

Mr. WHEAT. Madam Speaker, I ask permission to strike remarks in reference to the gallery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his comments, his eloquence, his friendship, and his lead-

ership in this body, as a member of the Rules Committee and as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation.

Madam Speaker, I take this well to offer concluding remarks to a continuation of a special order brought about through the conception and through the ideas of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY]. I want to thank the gentleman for again convening us today and for all the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus who have come to this well to raise before this Nation the very real nature and the condition of black America and to argue forcefully and effectively that the well-being of black America really is the well-being of all of us in this great Nation, and that this Nation cannot, nor should it ever consider, overlooking any one segment of its society deliberately or otherwise, without realizing the damage that it does to the entire society.

I come here also at the conclusion of this debate, recognizing that I am the last person to speak tonight, remembering as I do as a child that we were often taught that the last shall be first, and I think of that not in terms of myself, but in terms of the ongoing contradiction that seems to exist unfortunately in our society, that in fact we can even have people who come last, people who because of the color of their skin or because of their last name or because of the ethnicity or for some twisted reason must come behind someone else. I would urge Members of this body and again remind citizens of this Nation that that is not the American way.

But I come this evening remembering as I do, thinking about the state of our Nation, and in particular the state and the condition of those of us of African-American ancestry. I am reminded of the great eloquence of Abraham Lincoln who in 1848 in a speech delivered in Edwardsville, IL, addressed these words to his countrymen:

When you have succeeded in dehumanizing the Negro, when you have put him down and made it for him to be but as the beast of the field, when you have extinguished his soul in this world, and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure, that the demon you have roused will not turn and rend you?

What constitutes the bulwark of our freedom and independence? It is not our crown embattlements, our bristling seacoast, our Army or our Navy.

These are not our reliance against tyranny.

For all those may be turned against us without having made us weaker for the struggle.

Our reliance, he said, is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us.

Our reliance is in the spirit of freedom which prides itself as the heritage of all men everywhere.

Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doorstep.

Ignore the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them.

Accustom to trample on the rights of others and you have lost the creative genius of your own independence and become fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.

□ 1900

Lincoln's words, uttered over 143 years ago, in many respects have gone unheeded. Poverty, despair, hunger, homelessness, degradation, deprivation, denial, and disprivilege are too often the norm in a society that can and must do better.

So we are confronted, as Dr. King once said, with a fierce urgency of now. That is this unfolding conundrum of life and history that there really is such a thing as being too late, for procrastination is the great thief of time. Too often, philosophically, ideologically, and sociologically we find that we are sometimes stifled and stymied and stultified by those in our number who pontificate but do not produce, by those who confuse but will not clarify, by those who go but will not give, by those who seek but will not serve, and by those who harm the preservation of culture and our history by refusing to hold on to it.

So then we must be the ones to close the gap between what we say and what we do, what we accept and what we reject. For the great enemy of truth is very often not the lie, deliberate, contrived, dishonest; but the myth, persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic.

Too often, then, we hold fast to the conclusions of other people, we enjoy all of the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought. So then perhaps it is good on this occasion to recall the words of Jesse Jackson and Dr. James Cheek, and Dr. Martin Luther King and others who call and beckon back to us, in this very real time of need, and make the argument, in some instances from their graves, that we understand that we have yet to become the society that we seek to be. For the last 30 or 40 years many of us of African ancestry in this country have concentrated on the public sector to make our case. I would remind us and argue that in 1991 and beyond there must be also a new corporate focus, that we must focus anew on corporate America and that buying a page in a men's day program, for showing up at one of our conventions in some booth or suite, represents generosity. We argue and we insist for economic reciprocity. Corporations in many instances have boycotted the black community. Corporations have put us on aid by denying us trade, by refusing to deal with us.

And so black America, then, suffers from a budget deficit that is a direct result of a trade imbalance. We cannot balance our trade and reduce budget deficits in our community by simply dealing with public aid alone. We must also insist on expanding private trade. Historically, in this Nation the black community has had a free-trade policy.

We have not put up trade barriers, import restrictions in our community. But corporate America, understanding that and realizing it, in many respects has taken advantage of it by exploiting us and adopting a restraint-of-trade policy.

We have traded with them and, in doing so, helped to develop their businesses, but they have not always traded equally with us to help develop our businesses.

So we are looking for actions that will stop this restraint of trade. A fair and equitable return on the black dollar is a demand that black communities, black business people are making over and over again.

I speak about business development because that is my area of expertise in this body. But I could speak beyond that, as could many of you who watch this discussion tonight, about other things that speak again to the quality of life in this country for purposes of African ancestry and cause us to come to places like this, at moments like this, to make their case. And yet, just the other day I went to visit a proud lady celebrating her 109th anniversary, and she stands, even as I speak, in the New York Harbor. In her right hand is a great torch, in her left hand she clings the Declaration of Independence close to her breast.

On her head is a crown of spikes and on her feet are broken shackles that symbolize freedom from tyranny.

Yet, as that plane flew over, I could still look down and hear her cry out through silent and concrete lips, saying, "Send me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses who yearn to be free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send those, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me for I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

And so we came, each of us and all of us from different directions and different reasons, but we came and became those children of the new day Sun in this Nation that knows and puts new meaning in the words "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land of the pilgrims' pride, land where my fathers died. From every mountainside let freedom ring."

Just a few months ago, in many villages, towns, and hamlets across this Nation there occurred what many people refer to as a celebration of the 37th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown versus the Board of Topeka, KS.

When on May 17, 1954, nine men robed in black assembled on that historic day to announce their unanimous decision among the Nation's black citizens and among some of its whites there was indeed a celebration. At black colleges classes were suspended and parties were hastily assembled. There was dancing in the streets of Richmond, Raleigh, Baltimore, Washington, and shouts of victory echoed and reverber-

ated throughout our communities. Our parents saw, in that decision in 1954, the dawning of a new era. They felt in the innermost parts of their hearts and in fact in the bowels of their existence that this Nation was at long last launched on an unalterable course, and that the American idea was in fact to become the American reality. Yes, it is indeed true that that 1954 Supreme Court decision became the watershed in our Nation's history with respect to the law of the land and that that verdict, by a unanimous Supreme Court, became the threshold of a launching of a new era in all areas of life, for that same group of people who had suffered, endured, and survived three centuries of slavery, oppression, deprivation, denial, and disprivilege.

And from 1954 onward through the decade of the 1960's many of us felt that all sectors of this society were at last determined that we would overcome the legacy of our Nation's past.

□ 1910

But in 1969, a high-ranking official in the White House advised the President in what later became known as the Celebrated Memorandum. He said, and I quote,

That blacks had made so much progress in moving into the mainstream of American economic, social, and educational life that our Nation's policies * * * with respect to problems and issues related to the status of blacks should be accorded benign neglect

In a period of just 2 decades since then, through the 1970's and through the 1980's, that neglect, once proposed as benign, is now a neglect that has become malignant.

So, I believe and I suggest humbly to my colleagues this evening that we use this occasion, this eve of the 21st anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus, as a glittering reminder of the success of our experience, but also as a challenge to recommit ourselves to sharing the dream, the dream of Martin Luther King and Fannie Lou Hamer, the dream of Douglass, DuBois, and Washington and Tubman, the dreams of all those nameless and faceless people who just laid down one day and made their bodies a bridge that we might run across, and get to the Congress of the United States, and become the heads of corporations and to lead our communities, and we must do that, not just through our prose and through our poetry, or even through our prayers. We must do it through our action, action that removes a large part of our distress by first changing the conditions that created it.

So, on this occasion and on behalf of this distinguished organization in this body, I have come to say to my colleagues tonight that I have not given up on the American ideal or on the American possibility, and I ask my colleagues not to give up also. I am convinced that this Nation still stands be-

fore the world as perhaps the last expression of a possibility of man, devising a social order where justice is supreme ruler and law is but its instrument, where freedom is the dominant creed and order is its principle, where equity is the common practice and fraternity the common human condition, and it is also my opinion that we might be the last generation of Americans that has the opportunity to help our Nation fulfill its promise and to realize its possibility.

So, the Congressional Black Caucus, nameless and faceless as we are, seek over and over again to unite with the hearts and minds of other people, nameless and faceless throughout this Nation, who feel a burning desire to believe, as naive as it may be in this day and age, that, yes, all people are created equal, and that, yes, they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, and, yes, that among those shall be life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that we are prepared to take the Founders at their word and to call due the check on which they base the Constitution, and the Preamble, and the Declaration of Independence and all the other pronouncements that they issued to justify their revolution against tyranny. We call that check due, and we argue that in order for us to be that nation, that model that really leads the way, that we must remember that we are judged by how we treat the least of these, those people who are sleeping on grates across the street from the White House, those farmers in the Midwest who cannot make ends meet, that family in some large city that is trying to decide how they are just going to be able to pay the gas and electric or to send a kid to school, the middle-class families of this Nation who find now that they are continuing to bear the brunt of nonsense that we do. All those people, nameless and faceless, we stand for, and all those people make us proud that we, as African-ancestored Americans, are in fact Americans and are calling due that special note that the Founders of this Nation put forth.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, my thanks again to all those Members who have participated in this special order and to the thousands and thousands of people who have come and descended on Washington, DC, for these 4 or 5 days. It is my hope that we walk away, not just with a good feeling, but with an agenda, an agenda for positive change that takes the lead in pointing this Nation in its correct direction.

THE COUNTRY TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, it is an honor for me to speak this evening, and follow the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] and to echo in my small and humble way some of the themes he touched. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the country today. I want to talk about America this summer, I want to talk about what we have not been talking about, particularly since this body adjourned over a month ago.

With the entire cold war international system disappearing before our eyes during the month of August, I do not think it was any surprise at all, no surprise at all, that the attention of this country, the attention of the world, was riveted to the drama unfolding in another part of the world, and for those who have lived the tension of the last 70-some years, the nuclear tension, the tension of not having enough to take care of our families, our cities, our towns, our villages, our farmers, the tension of pitting poor people in Central America against each other or in Africa against each other and Asia against each other, the tension that was built around the financial collapse in many ways of this great country of ours because of our concern with the cold war, indeed it was not surprising at all to find the country so riveted on what happened in Moscow, in St. Petersburg and other places in the Soviet empire, the once Soviet empire.

□ 1920

But now pundits in the media, the electronic media, the news media, are calling for a Marshall plan for the Soviets. Some of our leaders outline ways to break the budget agreement and divert money to the fledgling republics. Editorial writers across the country today are busy penning away their endorsements of emergency aid to any new nation that embraces this concept of free trade. But those who gaze across the Atlantic, imagining ways to play a role in these momentous events, have only to turn around and see another dramatic story, a story of a courageous, hard-working people who have been squeezed from virtually every angle.

It is the story of America's families, and it is particularly poignant to look at America's families in the summer of 1991. They are squeezed by a deep and prolonged recession. And it is deep, and it is prolonged. Those who say that we are moving out of it fool themselves.

One only needs to look at the statistics. Housing is down more than eight-point-something percent, personal income is down, and 300,000 people are off the unemployment compensation rolls in the month of July alone. It is a deep recession.

In my State of Michigan, 9.3 percent of the people are unemployed, and that is up from 8.1 percent. We are squeezed by tough competition from Germany,

France, and the countries of the Pacific rim. We are squeezed by a system that has raised taxes on the poor and the middle class but given a \$25,000-a-year tax cut to the richest 1 percent of America. That is \$25,000 a year at the expense of America's families.

We are squeezed by a health care system that is expensive for those who have insurance. And heaven knows, it is expensive. All you need to do is talk to people who say they cannot go to the drug store to get the prescription drugs they need because they cannot afford the accelerating cost. They cannot afford to go to get that checkup that is needed, even though they have a suspicion that something is wrong with them, and God forbid the mental torment, the fear that something may be wrong with their child or with their parent. And they tell of their inability to take care of basic dental needs. They are squeezed by it, but they are not as squeezed as the 37 million Americans who have no health insurance, not a dime.

I tell this story back in my district often, and I tell it because it is true and because it moved me. It moved me deeply. I met with a group of women, five of them, who work in a nursing home. They belong to a labor union. It is a good labor union, yet they only make \$5 an hour. They are working in a nursing home, taking care of our mothers and our fathers, our grandmothers and our grandfathers, bathing them, changing their bedpans, caring for them and loving them; yet they themselves, mostly single parents, had no health insurance for themselves, for their loved ones, or for their children. One woman told me she goes to bed every single night saying a prayer that her children do not get sick.

During the last month, while the President busied himself with the Soviet crisis, the back pages of the newspapers throughout this country, Madam Speaker, confirmed the magnitude of the crisis right here at home. In August the numbers of long-term unemployed, those out of work for more than 26 weeks and still looking for jobs, rose to 1.2 million. More than 300,000 Americans exhausted their unemployment benefits in July alone, as I said. This was the highest 1-month total in the last 40 years. If we continue at this rate, the number of Americans who run out of unemployment benefits this year will exceed any year since the program was established in 1930.

I remember speaking from this microphone in this well about a year ago. It was after the President had committed us and our young men and women, along with some of our older men and women, to the Persian Gulf. There are 2 million more people out of work today in America. There are 2 million people out of work today in America that had jobs a year ago.

Since June of this year, three-quarters of a million Americans who had jobs have no jobs, and they have all the mental anguish that goes with that, worrying about paying the bills, making ends meet, paying for groceries, having enough set aside perhaps for the education of one of their children, and, of course, all the wonderful little extras in life that make life so enjoyable. They have seen those hopes and dreams shattered.

But they say to themselves, "Well, I'm going to get a little bit of a reprieve. Maybe the economy will turn around, but at least I know that we have an unemployment compensation system in this country. We have a health care system that has a lot of holes in it, but at least I will have something coming in to pay the mortgage and to take care of the basic needs of my family."

But what has happened? These Americans at an exceedingly fast rate have run out of benefits. It is an emergency of great magnitude for them and for the country.

Those of us here in the Congress came to the Congress of the United States, believed in the extension of unemployment compensation benefits because we know there is a pool of money available to help these people, over \$8 billion that has been paid into it to take care of a situation like this, and we said to the President of the United States, "Mr. President, we know under our budget agreement that it takes an emergency for you to release funds, but we've got a lot of hurting people here in this country. You took care of the needs of the Israelis, the Turks, the Kurds, and the people in Bangladesh who need assistance. You signed the bills into law that declared an emergency for them. Won't you help our own?"

And the President, who was in Maine on vacation—and he deserves a vacation because he works hard; I am not going to take that away from him—said to the American people, "I'll sign that bill, but I won't declare an emergency for Americans. I won't declare an emergency for that family who wants to put some food on the table for their loved ones. I won't declare an emergency for that family that needs to pay the mortgage, that family that is having difficulties or that has a sick child who needs medical care. But I'll sign the bill."

I do not know why he signed it, but he said, "I'll sign the bill," and maybe it was just to make it look as if he really cared. But if he really cared, he would have released the fund. He said no to releasing the fund.

□ 1930

So we are back to square one. We come before you again, Mr. President, in the process of providing for these Americans, and there are 10 million of

them out there out of work, with another bill. But this time, if you sign the bill, you release the funds.

That will be debated in this body next week. I hope my colleagues, no matter where they are from, what State, what region, will understand the pain, not only of their constituents, but the pain of textile workers in the Southeast who are out of work, of automobile workers in my district, 10 percent, perhaps, who have no jobs today and are laid off, of people who work in the lumber industry in the Northwest, in the computer industry, in the service industry that has been devastated, and, of course, government workers across this country who have been laid off by the tens of thousands recently because of the budget squeeze that we are undergoing.

I hope all of my colleagues will understand the pain that is going on with their friends who serve them on respective committees and in various buildings in this great Capitol of ours, and that we send the President a bill, and the President will say to the Americans, yes, you are as important to me as someone from Turkey, someone from Bangladesh, someone from Israel. I will take care of you.

What about health care? I talked about health care a little bit. By the year 2000, nearly one-sixth of our Nation's gross national product will be consumed by health care costs. One-sixth.

Our national spending on health care, which is already higher than any developed nation, will climb from 12.3 percent to 16.4 percent of gross national product by the end of the century.

I will tell you, if we do nothing and let that happen, the economic decline of this country will accelerate at a dizzying pace.

What are we getting for all of this money? Just this morning the Washington Post reported that more than one-half of the children age 2 and younger in the Washington area have not received their proper immunization. This sort of story is being repeated all across the country.

The health care system in this country is turning into a disaster. It is a system that people do not understand, with the Medicaid system, a Medicare system, a CHAMPUS system for the military, the private system, a VA system, and 37 million people with no system. It is a bureaucracy that is so laden and heavy with paperwork we spend 26 cents on \$1 in this country just on paperwork. That is where the health care dollar is. Twenty-six cents of it is just on paperwork.

Canadians, for instance, spend only 11 cents on paperwork. The Japanese, far less. The West Germans, far less than us.

With the costs of health care soaring, and many needs unmet, it is no wonder that our working families list health care as the No. 1 priority on their list.

We have all heard it. We all go back to our districts, no matter if it is in Iowa, Michigan, California, Vermont, Georgia, or Texas. You name it, we all have town meetings. We have Rotary Club meetings.

The thing we are hearing the most is, do something about health care. The costs are killing us. It is the No. 1 issue negotiated at the bargaining table in many industries today.

Many people, as I have indicated, do not have access. The issue is white hot. It is as hot as it can be. We have to move on it. We have to address it.

Our party, the Democratic caucus, in conjunction with the Senate leadership, will have a program for America on this issue in a very short time that will address the cost issue, the access issue, and the overall health care quality issue for the people of this country.

Now, let me go back, if I can, and talk about this administration and this recession.

Before we left the administration, the Secretary of Treasury said about the recession, it is, "No big deal." It is no big deal.

The OMB Director said give them unemployment compensation benefits and you basically, and I am paraphrasing, you basically only perpetuate their needs to not go back to work.

The President signs a bill, but does not declare the emergency. What callousness, what insensitivity, what a real lack of understanding of what is happening in American towns and cities across this country.

It is a damn big deal when you are out of work. It hurts to be out of work. It robs you of your dignity. It robs you of your ability to provide for your family's needs.

Anybody who has had a parent or a loved one, the head of the family, who is out of work, understands that. They understand that. They understand it in the morning when they wake up and have to face the gloom and despondency of that person. They understand it during the day when it is on their mind, as well as on the breadwinner's mind. And they understand it in the evening when the extra things that might be there to make the day enjoyable are not there.

It is a big deal, Mr. Brady. It is a real big deal.

A few other things about the troubling news we have learned during the month of August. The Commerce Department reported that personal income for Americans fell for the first time in over 6 months. The Nation's gross national product continued to shrink during the second quarter of 1991. The national unemployment rate remained unchanged during August, yet, in Michigan, as I have indicated, it skyrocketed up to over 9 percent.

Don't be fooled by the number, that it wasn't changed in August, that it was 6.8 percent in July and 6.8 percent

in August. It wasn't 6.8 percent in July. It was between 7 and 8 percent. What they do not tell you is that in July, 416,000 Americans dropped off the rolls and were not counted. They gave up hope. There was nothing out there. Nothing out there.

Ironically, the very same administration that brought us these sobering statistics also claim that the recovery is on its way, happy days are here again, and we are just around the corner. Everything is going to be fine, and hunky-dory, and just hang in there with us, and it is going to be just great.

But the American middle class was not fooled when the President trumpeted the end of the recession from his vacation home in Kennebunkport, in between his jogs around the golf course. The tough times are not over just because the President says they are, and our working families in this country know it.

The economic impact of the recession was not the only bad news of this recession. The GAO released its gloomiest assessment yet of the health of our banking system.

□ 1940

Almost 100 major banks will fail in the next 3 years at a cost of more than \$30 billion, with a "b," \$30 billion to pay off their depositors.

These are not just dry statistics. They are a symptom of an economy still struggling through a very profound and deep recession. And these statistics help to explain the deep frustration of America's middle class, frustrations of people whose lives are strained to the breaking point because they cannot make ends meet. And those who have not reached economic middle-class status, you can imagine the strain there. These are the issues that we have got to address in this Congress with a credible health care reform that can free our working families of the fear that sudden illness will wipe them out, with a tax relief for our people and a guarantee that the wealthiest citizens will pay their fair share to meet the Nation's needs.

We need to cut the taxes of the people who got zippo during the last 12 years, and that is most of America. People on the top did real well, the top 1 percent of America, people that have the incomes of \$300,000, \$400,000, \$500,000 a year. And there are a lot of them, 2.5 million of them did very well. After-tax income went up during the last decade 122 percent. The rest, the rest of us, flat or down. We paid for their good time.

It is called trickle down, but it never trickled down. It stayed on the top. It is a system of economics that is not fair, lacks substantial merit. We need to change that. We need a system of going up where we provide the working families in this country with a tax cut, put some money in their pockets, giv-

ing them the opportunity to pay off debt, to invest in their children's education or to buy the necessities that they have been denied for so many years. That is what we are going to do in this Congress.

We are going to provide the vast majority of families in this country with a tax cut, not the top, but those people who have been left out.

So if you are a person left out there, if you have been the ones were the tax bite has been the hardest, do not feel you have gotten any relief, we are going to put a bill on the floor that is going to pass. And we will send it to the President, and we are going to hope he is going to sign it because we need it. We need it to grow and to get out of this recession.

We did it during 1962, I believe, the Kennedy administration got this country moving ahead. We will do it for the right reasons, and we will do it for the right people.

We need to put money in their pockets, and it needs to be the engine of economic growth.

Madam Speaker, the time has come to focus our attention right at home in America. Of course, we want to respond with compassion and generosity to the needs of others. We have done that. We will always do that. We will take pride as Americans for doing it. But first we have got to take care of our own right here at home, and each week I intend to raise this issue of taking care of Americans, whether it is unemployment compensation benefits, whether it is rebuilding our roads and bridges and highways and putting 2 million people to work over 5 years, as we will do with the transportation bill when it comes to the floor later this fall, whether it is middle-income tax cuts for the people who have not got anything over the last 10 years, we are going to challenge the country, the President, my colleagues on this side of the aisle to step forward and start looking after Americans, start looking after the people that have been paying the bill, start looking after the constituents that send us here, start looking after those kids that do not have a proper education, do not have health care they deserve, do not have the immunization shots that they should have.

I ask my colleagues who are interested in these issues to join with me. Let us give the struggling republics in the Soviet Union something they can really use, they can really use, a lesson by example of a nation that can take care of itself.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBERTS) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. INHOFE, for 60 minutes, on September 16.

Mr. ROBERTS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESPY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ECKART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STALLINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELLUMS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on September 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 27, and 30, October 3 and 4.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois, for 60 minutes, on September 17.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DELLUMS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, for 60 minutes, on September 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROBERTS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MACHTELY in two instances.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. ROTH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ESPY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. MCCURDY.

Mr. KILDEE in two instances.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. MILLER.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. ACKERMAN in four instances.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. BRUCE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, September 16, 1991, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2059. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of September 1, 1991, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 102-139), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONIOR. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 221; a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3040, a bill to provide a program of Federal supplemental compensation, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TORRES. Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 2654. A bill to require the clear and uniform disclosure by depository institutions of interest rates payable and fees assessable with respect to deposit accounts; with an amendment (Rept. 102-202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE):

H.R. 3313. A bill extending nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KYL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LENT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SARFALIUS, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VISCOSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 3314. A bill to extend nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) treatment to

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require consideration by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation of the interests of the employees and former employees of depository institutions for which such corporation has been appointed conservator or receiver; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to obtain certain telephone subscriber information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNARD (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. RAY):

H.R. 3317. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require disclosure of short positions of major short position holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 3318. A bill to clarify and make uniform the maritime law of the United States with respect to the recovery and allocation of compensatory damages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EWING, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine):

H.R. 3319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat as sale proceeds of a residence amounts paid by the Secretary of Defense representing the reduction in the value of the residence on account of a military base closing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 3320. A bill to improve education for all students by restructuring the education system in the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 3321. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for State and area volunteer services coordinators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 3322. A bill to designate the Wellston Station facility of the U.S. Postal Service in St. Louis, MO, as the "Gwen B. Giles Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3323. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that students of occupational therapy are eligible borrowers for purposes of the program established in title VII of such act for insuring loans for education in the health professions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 3324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the entire 5-cent increase in motor fuels taxes enacted by the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990 shall be deposited into the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 3325. A bill to allow Connecticut to permit certain recipients of aid to families with dependent children a one-time election to purchase capital equipment for a small business, to prohibit depreciation of such equipment, and to require that repayments

by such persons of the principal portion of small business loans be treated as business expenses for purposes of the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 3326. A bill to augment and clarify law enforcement agency roles in ordering aircraft to land and vessels to bring to, to enable improved money laundering investigations, to promote drug testing in Federal and State criminal justice systems, and for other law enforcement system improvements; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ways and Means, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. RANGELL):

H.R. 3327. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the designation of an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the Chief Minority Affairs Officer of the Department; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H.R. 3328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase of up to 10 in the number of years disregarded in determining average annual earnings on which benefit amounts are based upon a showing of preclusion from remunerative work during such years occasioned by need to provide child care or care to a chronically dependent relative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.R. 3329. A bill to amend subpart 4 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to encourage more efficient and effective administration of the TRIO Programs by mandating a 5-year grant cycle; requiring adequate notice of the success or failure of grant applications; encouraging coordination among institutional, State, and Federal programs for disadvantaged students; strengthening early identification efforts; and continuing the authorization of appropriations for the programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 3330. A bill to improve the effectiveness of the provisions of the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1990; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 3331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the definitions of highly compensated employee and compensation for pension plan purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3332. A bill to simplify the tariff classification of certain plastic flat goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3333. A bill to provide congressional approval of the Governing International Fishery Agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.R. 3334. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide Perkins Loan forgiveness to encourage individuals who enter the teaching profession to teach in schools serving low-income areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution designating October 30, 1991, as "Refugee Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOBSON (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RITTER, Ms. LONG, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution designating October 12, 1991, as "Centennial of Concrete Paving in America Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to recommend that the United Nations Security Council dispatch United Nations forces to the Republic of Croatia for the purpose of stopping the bloodshed there; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY (for himself, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the need for a Conference on Security, Stability, Development, and Cooperation in Africa and commending the Helsinki Commission for its leadership on this initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should not provide direct financial assistance to the Soviet Union until the Soviet Union ceases all of its direct economic and military support for the regime of Fidel Castro; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. WATERS):

H. Res. 220. Resolution to honor accomplishments and express the appreciation for a dedicated career in public service of the Honorable William H. Gray III on the occasion of his resignation; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PENNY:

H. Res. 222. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should provide agricultural export credit guarantees and technical assistance to the Soviet Union, the Baltic Nations, and the Soviet Republics to avert hunger and support economic, political, and social reforms there; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 62: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 75: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 78: Mr. CONDIT.
H.R. 85: Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 123: Mr. WALSH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.
H.R. 127: Mr. KYL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ORTON, Mr.

VENTO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 200: Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 251: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 252: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 255: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 256: Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 281: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 288: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MOODY, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 310: Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 311: Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 318: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 413: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. COBLE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. RAY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 467: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STUMP, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 504: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 565: Mr. JAMES, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 710: Mr. OWENS of Utah and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 755: Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 791: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 793: Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 827: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 829: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 840: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 843: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 852: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 856: Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 862: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 880: Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 886: Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 911: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 951: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROE, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 978: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1025: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1063: Mr. VENTO, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1076: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1092: Mr. BENNETT and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1124: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 1185: Mr. QUILLLEN.

H.R. 1190: Mr. McCLOSKEY and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 1201: Mr. PERKINS and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 1218: Mr. COYNE, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1239: Mr. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 1240: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1257: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1277: Ms. PELOSI Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. WISE, Mr. REED, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 1346: Mr. LARROCCA, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1360: Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1364: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1405: Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1414: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1433: Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 1447: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 1467: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ANTHONY, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1468: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 1473: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 1481: Mr. WYLIE and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1495: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RAY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. APLEGATE.

H.R. 1504: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1516: Mr. WALKER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1547: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1598: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1601: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1608: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 1617: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1650: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1662: Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1663: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1681: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1723: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1733: Mr. VENTO, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1771: Mr. BARNARD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1856: Mr. PARKER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ESPY, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1889: Mr. RAY.

H.R. 2041: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 2063: Mr. VENTO, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2098: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 2215: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ROE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2224: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2229: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2336: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. FALCOMAVALGA, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 2354: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 2374: Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 2410: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2416: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 2451: Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2452: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 2455: Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 2464: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2470: Mr. POSHARD and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 2493: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 2530: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 2534: Mr. PERKINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WISE, Mr. ORTON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2553: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2561: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2598: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LUKE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 2633: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2695: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 2717: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2746: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2755: Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2773: Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 2840: Mr. SABO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2881: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 2894: Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROE, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 2922: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. YATES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2943: Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 2946: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. QUILLLEN.

H.R. 2974: Mr. MORAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3002: Mr. EVANS, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 3015: Mrs. LOWEY of New York and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 3048: Mr. KYL and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3062: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 3070: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOODY,

Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 3092: Mr. DORNAN of California and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3098: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 3105: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3128: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ROE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 3130: Mr. FIELDS and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 3152: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 3171: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3172: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3192: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 3195: Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3211: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3231: Mr. ESPY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. YATES, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3236: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3280: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3281: Mr. FROST and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3286: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 3311: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. LOWERY of California and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.J. Res. 223: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.J. Res. 233: Mr. SHARP and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.J. Res. 235: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. SHAYS.

H.J. Res. 241: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ORTON, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.J. Res. 244: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 253: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LUKE, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. QUILLLEN.

H.J. Res. 274: Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 284: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. MCDERMOTT,

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.J. Res. 294: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 302: Mr. PENNY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.J. Res. 305: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 316: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. HORN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROE, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. REED and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. VOLKMER.

H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, and Ms. DELAUNO.

H. Con. Res. 198: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. APPELEGATE.

H. Res. 107: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BEVILL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. RHODES.

H. Res. 204: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. RANGEL.